DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 163 SP 035 681

AUTHOR Cornett, Lynn M.; Gaines, Gale F.
TITLE Reflecting on Ten Years of Incentive Programs: The 1993 SREB Career Ladder Clearinghouse Survey.
INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 49p.
AVAILABLE FROM Southern Regional Education Board, 592 Tenth St., N.W., Atlanta, GA 30318-5790.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Ladders; *Educational Policy; Educational Trends; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Incentives; Job Performance; *Merit Pay; *Personnel Policy; Recognition (Achievement); Secondary School Teachers; State Programs; Surveys; *Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

This paper reflects on the evolution of teacher performance incentive policies and draws conclusions from 10 years of monitoring trends in performance incentive policies, from the explosion of interest in career ladder plans in the mid-1980s through teacher and school incentive programs tied to comprehensive restructuring initiatives in the early 1990s. The paper examines state policy, teacher perspectives, teacher evaluation, and evidence of results. The analysis is presented in a chronological format, beginning in the early 1980s when incentive programs were developed in response to the perceived need to reward superior teaching. It explores funding issues that were faced by incentive programs as state budgets tightened. It discusses the trend to focus on rewarding teachers for what they produce--what students learn. Variations in state actions, which increased or decreased support for career ladder and incentive programs, are documented. Analysis of each state is then presented individually, documenting program initiatives and financial support. A list of state contacts concludes the document. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Southern Regional Education Board
CAREER LADDER CLEARINGHOUSE

April 1994

ED 378 163

Ups and Downs of Incentive Programs

by Lynn M. Cornett

SREB has spent more than a decade tracking shifts in performance incentive policies, from the explosion of interest in career ladder plans in the mid-1980s through today's teacher and school incentive programs tied to comprehensive restructuring initiatives. These conclusions are drawn from 10 years of monitoring and reporting on trends in incentive program policy.

State Policy

- ✓ Programs that fundamentally alter pay structures based on performance can produce fundamental change.
- ✓ Comprehensive evaluation of incentive programs has occurred in only a few states.
- ✓ Actions to fund, not fund, or disband programs are rarely based on real knowledge of programs and effects on students.
- ✓ Career ladder programs that include administrators may work against the original intent of keeping the best teachers in the classroom.

(cont'd on page 2)

Reflecting on Ten Years of Incentive Programs

The 1993 SREB Career Ladder Clearinghouse Survey

Lynn M. Cornett and Gale F. Gaines

Ten years ago in 1984:

- Six states were funding authentic career ladder programs, either statewide or through pilot projects: Arizona, Missouri, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah.
- California supported a mentor teacher program emphasizing extra pay for extra duties.
- Florida started its Master Teacher Program, with extra pay for meritorious performance.
- South Carolina began new teacher and principal incentive pay pilot programs.
- Fifteen additional states had proposed legislation or task forces to explore paying teachers based on performance or additional work.

Today in 1994:

- Four states support career ladder programs—Arizona, Missouri, Tennessee, and Utah. Ohio funds pilot projects.
- Nine states fund mentor teacher efforts—California, Connecticut, Georgia, Louisiana, Indiana, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Washington, and West Virginia.
- Five states fund incentive programs linked to school restructuring and improvement —Arizona, Florida, Iowa, Oregon, and Washington.
- Six states now fund incentive programs that reward schools for improved performance—Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas. Tennessee plans to fund a program in 1994-95.

(cont'd on page 2)

For more information, contact: Southern Regional Education Board
592 Tenth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30318-5790
(404) 875-9211

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. C. Norton
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ups and Downs *(cont'd from page 1)*

- ✓ Too often, state leadership changes (governor, state superintendent, key legislators) have meant programs move away from the original intent, never become implemented as intended, or are not given enough time to work.
- ✓ Programs have continued in states, districts, and schools where strong leadership by educators and government officials has been evident.

Teacher Perspectives

- ✓ Most teachers, when given the chance, choose to receive additional pay for more work rather than for demonstrating high performance.
- ✓ Teachers who participate in incentive programs are positive about the programs; those who do not, are negative.
- ✓ Teachers who philosophically disagree with the idea of pay for performance will probably never see any type of incentive program working.

Teacher Evaluation

- ✓ Teacher evaluation has changed—becoming more comprehensive and using teachers to evaluate teachers.
- ✓ A perceived lack of fairness in teacher evaluation has led to eliminating programs. Evaluation that attempts to be selective continues to be controversial.

Locally Developed Programs

- ✓ Locally developed pilot programs have involved teachers in developing workable plans that reflect local needs.
- ✓ Individual pilot incentive programs designed at the district levels without a guiding vision or support from the state have resulted in few fundamental changes or programs that last.

Evidence of Results

- ✓ One career ladder program (Arizona) that focused on pay for performance showed increased student achievement, lowered dropout rates, and increased graduation rates for students taught by teachers in the program.
- ✓ Despite concrete evidence that the Arizona Career Ladder had positive results, the state funding decreased, shifting some of the costs to local districts.
- ✓ Ten years of experience show that fundamental change in structures has occurred in very few schools across the nation because of the incentive programs.

Some Final Thoughts

- ✓ Comprehensive incentive programs mean fundamental changes in the business of how schools operate and roles of principals and teachers in schools.
- ✓ Too often, strong positive or negative reactions that signal fundamental changes are mistaken as evidence that programs aren't working.
- ✓ Comprehensive incentive programs that alter fundamentally the ways teachers work and are paid have promise for improving results for students.

In the early 1980s, career ladder and teacher incentive programs were among the most visible and widespread educational experiments being undertaken by states. A decade later, programs in some states have given way to other experimentation; in other states, programs have been refined or revamped to fit into new systemic reform initiatives. The core questions behind the career ladder and incentive movement persist, however, and they continue to have a place in policy debates about school improvement. Can incentive systems be devised that will strengthen the performance of teachers and improve the achievement of students? And can such systems make teaching more attractive and rewarding—and more professional?

SREB's involvement in career ladder and teacher incentives began in the early 1980s with its work on improving the linkages between schools and colleges. Interest in reward programs was developing in the region, in both the education and business communities. As this interest grew, the Southern Governors' Association and the Southern Legislative Conference encour-

aged SREB to establish a clearinghouse for information about teacher career ladders and incentive programs.

SREB began publishing reports under its "Career Ladder Clearinghouse" emblem in 1984 and has produced dozens of studies and monographs since that time, including an annual survey of activities in all 50 states. After monitoring the development of incentive programs across the nation for a decade, it seems appropriate to devote some time to a reflection on their evolution and their likely future.

January 1983: *"Rewarding superior teaching may be a key to attracting and holding bright young people."*

During the early 1980s there was a heightened concern about the quality of the teaching force. Much of the debate was fueled by teacher shortages in areas like mathematics and science, and studies showed teaching was not attracting the "best and brightest." The earliest incentive programs appeared to be a response to the fact that superior teaching was not rewarded and that somehow education needed to provide rewards to those who did a better job. By 1985, over half the states in the country had either enacted or approved plans for statewide implementation or pilot projects to provide incentives for teachers.

The initiatives that really got off the ground with substantial funding were career ladder programs in North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah. Other programs also began in Arizona, California, and South Carolina. California began investing in a mentor teacher program that rewarded teachers for taking on additional work with beginning teachers or with fellow veteran teachers. South Carolina not only funded a school incentive program where reward money went for instructional materials, but also piloted both a teacher and principal incentive plan. Both plans used progress in student achievement as a key measure. Career ladder programs in North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas designed state-level evaluations to determine how teachers would progress up the career ladder. Results of evaluations and experience were used initially to place teachers on the ladder and teachers were ultimately expected to assume new roles. Rewards for better or different work were designed so that the best teacners would remain in the classroom. (Tennessee was the only one of the three states to fully implement all levels of its career ladder program.)

The Utah Career Ladder Program took a somewhat different approach. It had four parts: an extended contract year; a performance bonus; a career ladder (evaluation was developed at the local level under state guidelines), and job enlargement. Improving student achievement was a key part of the initial legislation. Arizona's 1984 legislation provided for a career ladder program to be developed by districts under state guidelines. The program emphasized student achievement and required that districts completely restructure compensation programs rather than simply "add on" to existing salary schedules. This unique element in the Arizona plan stood out from other programs which were developed at about the same time. As we look back over 10 years, it may explain why Arizona's effort has succeeded over a longer term than efforts in other states.

These earlier programs were designed to avoid the many pitfalls associated with traditional merit pay programs: Incentives that were too small or that caused competition and discord among teachers; teacher evaluation that was suspect; awards that were limited to a few teachers; and the lack of teacher involvement in the program design and development. How well did many of the early programs learn from lessons of the past? The results were mixed.

Evaluation—which became increasingly important as teachers worked to qualify for awards—was often a point of contention in program development. Evaluation was usually challenged on the grounds of fairness and whether the methods used really measured good teaching. In some early programs, teachers became involved in the evaluation of peers. This involvement strengthened a feeling of ownership and bolstered the programs.

Balance was also an important issue in the early programs—creating a balance between too few and too many teachers receiving awards. (An early teacher survey in South Carolina showed that 90 percent of the teachers thought they were in the "top 10 percent.") North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas, among others, attempted to address the question by setting criteria for Level I on the career ladder that could be met by most teachers. Today in Tennessee, about 95 percent of the state teachers have meet the requirements for Level I. And Tennessee followed a typical pattern at the upper levels; the criteria became more challenging and restrictive and fewer teachers were able or willing to qualify (about one-third in Tennessee reach Levels II and III).

North Carolina developed its program as a four-year pilot project and did not make a long-term commitment to teachers who sought classification at the upper levels. The idea that "incentives should not be awarded to only a few" probably led to the eventual demise of the Texas program, when policymakers perceived that too many teachers were on the career ladder. Since only the first two levels (designed to include large numbers of teachers) of a planned 4-step ladder were implemented, the Texas program was never seen as selective. The early program in Florida, the "Master Teacher Program," never really got off the ground and was quickly changed because it provided too few awards. The criteria of being in the upper quartile on both a written test and classroom evaluation meant that only a very select few (possibly 10 percent) would be eligible to receive the award.

Teacher involvement in the development of incentive programs was critical. Some states failed to involve teachers from a large group of representative school districts in the initial design of statewide programs. This led to early dissension in states like North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. On the other hand, programs left to be developed at the local district or school level through pilot projects rarely developed into broadly implemented plans. In fact, if one looks at the early programs that were never funded or were small pilot projects with plans completely developed by districts, it can be said across the board those did not develop into statewide initiatives for rewarding teachers.

July 1985: *"State leaders have said that developing performance based compensation plans is a complex task. Now that they are into the task, they say that with even more conviction."*

By 1985, Tennessee and Utah had full-fledged career ladder programs. The California Mentor Teacher Program had been expanded, and South Carolina had provided pilot funds for teacher and principal incentive programs, as well as a rewards program for high-achieving schools. Missouri funded a long-term phase-in of a career ladder program that required teachers to assume additional responsibilities in order to move up the ladder. Texas increased funding for its career ladder. At the same time, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Mexico, Virginia, and West Virginia started small pilot programs. Alabama and Georgia put legislation on the books for comprehensive career ladder programs.

Some legislated programs—including those in Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, and Texas—included substantial general pay raises for teachers. Georgia gave its teachers a 12 percent increase, and tenured teachers in Alabama received 15 percent increases. In Tennessee, teachers were given a 10 percent across-the-board pay raise. Texas increased salaries for beginning and veteran teachers by about $4,000. These increases generally came in the form of trade-offs with teacher organizations in return for their support of career ladder programs. However, in two states where large pay increases were given—Alabama and Georgia—career ladder plans were never funded or implemented.

During this same period, Utah funded an extensive third-party evaluation of its career ladder program. Smaller evaluations were conducted in Tennessee, and adjustments were made in the state's teacher evaluation procedures. In both states, teachers were volunteering to participate in greater numbers than were originally expected.

As career ladder experiments proceeded, it was becoming clear that full implementation (several levels of progression and large numbers of participants) would require huge state investments year after year. Tennessee, the only state to ever fully fund its career ladder, now spends slightly over $100 million per year. Before the Texas career ladder legislation was repealed in 1993, the state was spending about $300 million per year, which provided money for only the first two of four career levels. The third and fourth levels were never implemented and additional local funding was needed to pay for teachers on the first two levels. Utah greatly expanded the funding of its program to about $40 million. Estimates for Georgia were that the fully implemented career ladder would cost $900 million over five years.

During this time, SREB began to ask the question, "Can career ladder plans create opportunities for a fundamental restructuring of the profession?" It was too early to know whether real changes were taking place, but it was clear that teacher evaluation was at the heart of success or failure of the early programs.

Legal challenges raised questions in court about evaluation procedures—and court decisions supported the evaluation procedures already in place. In some states, the development of career ladders was changing teacher evaluation for the better. Utah reported that teacher evaluation had become much more comprehensive and involved teachers to a much greater degree in planning. The director of the Utah program described the process this way: "Those districts that are able to think outside of the box and involve teachers in substantive ways in planning, will be those with creative, successful programs."

The portions of the state programs that affected veteran or tenured teachers continued to be the most controversial—as were programs that focused primarily on rewards for superior teaching, however defined. While programs were viable, there was no overall sense from watching these programs unfold that thinking about how teachers should be paid or about the structures and roles for teachers in schools were really changing.

December 1986 *"Are incentive programs here to stay?"*

Several state and national reports released in 1986 recommended programs to reward teachers for outstanding teaching and for different kinds of work. In those states where such programs were already underway, several trends were emerging. Teacher evaluation was rapidly changing. Funding was becoming an issue as policymakers considered program expansion. States were reporting an increasing focus on classrooms and instruction, especially by princi-

pals. There was also evidence, however, that prevailing attitudes about "the way we do it here" would be difficult to change.

Questions were being raised about whether career ladder and incentive programs created too much of a burden on teachers. Did teachers have too much paperwork? Was evaluation too time consuming for teachers or principals? Attitude surveys suggested that teachers who participated in the incentive programs were positive about their effects; teachers who did not participate were negative.

Several early career ladder designs (such as those in South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah) called for student achievement to be one of the key criteria. In 1986, however, only Arizona had pushed forward to implement a career ladder program that focused on increasing student achievement. The South Carolina School Incentive Program, with rewards going back to the schools for increased school achievement, was receiving more kudos in the state than programs giving rewards to individual teachers and principals.

In several plans, teachers were given the opportunity to choose how they would earn incentive money. They tended to select extended contracts or additional duties rather than bonuses for better teaching. This was clearly demonstrated in Utah where districts could choose among several options, including extended contracts, career ladders, taking on new duties, or performance bonuses for good teaching. In the beginning, many programs were designed to reward the "best teaching"—as time passed, many moved in the direction of providing more pay for more work.

July 1987 *"Incentive programs faced the first real test with tightening state budgets in 1987."*

As states began to feel the pinch of lower revenues and an economy that was slowing, policymakers began to question whether career ladder and incentive programs would continue to be funded. It seemed fairly clear that early programs (1983-85) which had not been funded or were funded only as small pilot projects would never be funded for full implementation. On the other hand, by 1987, no state that had committed substantial funding had backed away from a career ladder or incentive program. (Funding actually increased for most of these teacher incentive programs through 1989—including Arizona, Missouri, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. In California, the Mentor Teacher Program was fully funded for the first time in 1988.)

August 1988 *"We continue to ask a key question—whether or not commitment by political and educational leadership both at the state and local level will be sustained long enough to give the programs a fair test. It is clear that programs are not yet finished products."*

National and state discussions focused more and more on results for students. The debate began to center around two ideas: holding schools, principals, and teachers more accountable for student achievement, and allowing more decision-making at the school level. SREB recommended 12 goals for the region—including readiness for school, increased student achievement, and reduced dropout rates.

Only Arizona, North Carolina, and Utah had funded comprehensive evaluations of their incentive programs. Researchers who studied the Utah programs concluded that teachers and schools had either strong positive or negative reactions, signaling fundamental change underway in school management and instruction. The evaluation further showed that teachers were

sharing a common language to discuss curriculum reform, teaching effectiveness, and teacher evaluation. Teachers were taking on more responsibility in developing curriculum and evaluating peers. Implementation varied greatly from district to district. The studies found strong connections between the depth of implementation in each school and the program's ultimate impact. Career ladder programs were having the most effect in districts where district, school, and teacher goals were carefully aligned and there was an approach to managing instruction.

Arizona's evaluation revealed that the career ladder teachers showed much more support for the concept than those who were not participating. In Missouri, job satisfaction was higher among career ladder teachers. In Tennessee, money for teachers to take on additional duties such as summer programs became available to all the teachers in the state, not just those who met criteria to be on the ladder.

School incentive programs were proposed in Arkansas, Colorado, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Texas. Discussion surrounding legislative action included references to teamwork, rewarding all teachers in the school, and focusing on results for students.

January 1990 *"What is not so clear is whether the most recent trend to focus on students in schools and results means that there will be less emphasis on rewarding teachers for what they do as opposed to what they produce—what students learn."*

By 1990, state actions reflected a national mood in favor of a focus on results. But efforts continued to reward teachers for what they did rather than how well students performed. Two-thirds of the public in a Gallup Poll favored rewarding "educationally successful" schools. The National Governors' Association called for rewards for progress in student achievement. The Education Summit produced six education goals for the nation and called for tracking national and state progress toward reaching the goals.

Funding was stable or increased for teacher incentive programs that were already being implemented. Legislation creating school incentive programs was passed in Kentucky and Texas. Additionally, Oklahoma passed legislation to create district-designed incentive programs. By this time, seven states were funding school incentive programs. Oklahoma passed legislation in 1991 that would make use of the criteria under development by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) as a way to identify teachers to receive rewards.

North Carolina initiated a differentiated pay plan built on earlier legislation that called for districts to focus on student results. (By 1993 the laws were extended to make the school building the level of accountability for reporting and for design of differentiated pay plans.) At the same time, plans were made to reduce funding for the four-year career ladder pilot program in North Carolina. (Recent discussions in 1994 indicate a concern that differentiated pay plans focus too much on processes for teachers such as attending training or workshops rather than rewards for changes in student outcomes or student results.)

The continuing five-year evaluation of the Arizona Career Ladder Program pointed to difficulties in implementation and the reluctance of educators to take on new roles. The evaluation noted that two-thirds of districts were not ready to implement the program. The need for organizations to have the necessary management and communication to carry out changes was increasingly being recognized. In fact, the Arizona evaluation noted that the program's design was not the most important factor in determining whether teachers and principals assumed new roles—the most important factors appeared to be "the readiness of the district," how effectively persons had been involved, and whether communication was taking place. On the other hand,

the evaluation showed the program had positive effects on student achievement and teacher motivation.

Shortfalls continued in state budgets across the nation preventing several states from considering implementing new programs.

January 1992 *"Will they continue to be seen as 'add on' programs or will they become more a part of the fabric—a catalyst for changes in schools?"*

By the end of 1991, about half of the nation's states were funding incentive programs. Nine states had mentor teacher programs, and seven states supported career ladder projects (six of the seven had increased funding). Eight states had committed funding to school incentive programs. Some states built new or expanded incentive programs into their comprehensive restructuring programs. The Iowa Educational Excellence Program, started in 1987, had been altered to encourage more fundamental change through school innovations. Iowa funded a Teacher Incentive/School Restructuring Program intended to improve the quality and performance of Iowa's teachers by allowing them to take on additional work and participate in performance-based plans. Some districts reported that teachers assumed leadership positions with new roles and responsibilities under the program.

The Arizona Career Ladder projects had unique characteristics from the beginning—most notably a requirement that districts change the total compensation structures for teachers. All teacher evaluations were linked to student performance, and the ultimate goal and focus of the program was on improved student achievement. According to evaluations, the program was not perceived as an extra, but as a fundamental change in the way teachers were evaluated and compensated. The research underscored the value of individual teacher accountability for student progress and of professional development for teachers tied to clear program goals. Districts reported they had completely redesigned teacher evaluation, student assessment, and staff development as a result of the program. Paperwork and teacher workloads continued to be areas of concern.

At the same time Texas was creating a school incentive program based on results of students, the teacher appraisal system for the career ladder program was undergoing study. While about three-fourths of teachers and principals thought the teacher observation evaluation system could discriminate among a full range of teaching practices, the study found that only two classifications were generally used—"exceeds expectations" and "clearly outstanding." The report noted that since high levels of performance were needed to move up the ladder, appraisers might have been reluctant to give teachers average or below average scores.

Concerns about whether observational data could be used alone to effectively make decisions about "better and best teaching" practice was mirrored in an SREB study, "Teacher Evaluation Programs in SREB States." The study suggested that existing programs were most effective in judging a teacher's ability to demonstrate basic competency or the entry level skills necessary to obtain a license to teach.

February 1993 *"Opinions from those outside schools continue to show support for performance-based pay—some states maintained momentum, others did not."*

Coming out of the recession, several states maintained or increased support for career ladder and incentive programs. Arizona, Missouri, and Texas increased funding for career ladder

programs for 1993, but Texas later repealed its program during the 1993 legislative session. While many other programs in Missouri's 1985 Reform Act remained unfunded, the career ladder program received increased funding to continue toward its full implementation. Utah continued its level of funding in 1993 and 1994. A new comprehensive evaluation shows that the Utah Career Ladder Program has improved educational programs (Horan & Lambert, 1994). The California Mentor Teacher program has grown steadily for 10 years with state funding fairly constant despite difficult economic times.

By 1993, evidence from the evaluations of several incentive programs indicated that teachers and school principals were more involved in joint decisions than ever before. Incentive programs where teachers take on extra work such as mentor programs did not reach full potential because of insufficient time and training for those in the program. Researchers of the Arizona Career Ladder Program continued to report positive results, including increases in student achievement (Arizona Department of Education, January 1994). Despite these positive evaluations, the 1993 Arizona legislature, faced with statewide cost-cutting, reduced state funding and shifted part of the cost to districts. This reduced level of funding will continue in 1995.

South Carolina's pilot programs to reward teachers and principals based on student progress were not funded in 1993. A new law called for a campus incentive program to award personnel in schools that demonstrate superior performance and productivity. (The program is not yet operational, and money initially appropriated for the program was diverted to help fund teacher pay raises.)

The Pennsylvania School Incentive Program, first funded in 1989, received no funds in 1993 or 1994. Louisiana did not fund its school incentive program beyond the development years. But the school incentive plan in Texas doubled funding for 1993, and Kentucky will, for the first time in 1994, provide additional funding to schools making progress in student results. School improvement and restructuring projects in Iowa and Michigan reduced funding—signaling some shift in the emphasis on the programs. A third-party evaluation in Iowa concluded its Educational Excellence Program is a major vehicle for school reform, but funding decreased slightly in 1994 as compared to 1993. In Michigan, pilot projects for restructuring are no longer funded, but school improvement plans—which can include incentives—are being supported with increased funding.

Selected Resources

Arizona Department of Education (1994, January). *Measures and Related Outcomes, Group 1 Career Ladder School Districts.* Research and Development, Phoenix, Arizona.

Cornett, Lynn M. & Gaines, Gale F. (December 1987 through February 1993). Annual Career Ladder publications. Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Georgia.

Cornett, Lynn M. (December 1985 through July 1987). Annual Career Ladder publications. Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Georgia.

Cornett, Lynn M. & Weeks, Karen (December 1984 through July 1985). Annual Career Ladder publications. Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Georgia.

Horan, Carolyn B. & Lambert, Vicki (1994, January). *Evaluation of Utah Career Ladder Programs.* Prepared for the Utah State Office of Education and Utah State Legislature by the Beryl Buck Institute for Education. Salt Lake City, Utah.

INCENTIVE PROGRAMS — 1993

	Local Initiative	Pilots with State Funding and/or Assistance	Full Implementation of State Program	State Program Under Development	Discussion No Legislative Action Pending	Type of Program
Alabama			X			
Alaska	X				X	Teacher Incentive
Arizona		X(1)	X(2)			(1) School Restructuring (2) Career Ladder
Arkansas				X		Mentor Teacher
California			X			Mentor Teacher
Colorado	X(1)			X(2) (Not funded) X(3)		(1) Teacher Incentive (2) Teacher/School Incentive (3) Tiered Licensing
Connecticut			X(1)	X(2) (Not funded)		(1) Mentor Teacher (2) Career Development
Delaware						
Florida			X			School Improvement/ Accountability
Georgia			X(1)(2)			(1) School Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher
Hawaii				X		Mentor Teacher
Idaho			X(1) (Not funded)	X(2) (Not funded)		(1) Mentor Teacher (2) Career Compensation
Illinois	X					Teacher Incentive
Indiana	X(1)		X(2) X(3)			(1) Career Ladder/ Development (2) Mentor Teacher (3) School Incentive
Iowa			X			Teacher Incentive/ School Transformation
Kansas	X					Teacher Incentive
Kentucky				X		School Incentive
Louisiana		X(1) (Not funded) X(3)		X(2) (Not funded)		(1) Career Options (2) School Incentive (3) Mentor Teacher
Maine			X			Tiered Certification
Maryland	X					Career Development Incentive
Massachusetts				X(1)(2)		(1) Tiered Certification (2) Mentor Teacher
Michigan	X					Teacher Incentive
Minnesota	X(1)	X(2)				(1) Teacher Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher
Mississippi				X		Mentor Teacher
Missouri			X			Career Ladder
Montana	X(1)	X(2)				(1) Teacher Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher
Nebraska						
Nevada	X					Teacher Incentive
New Hampshire	X					Teacher Incentive
New Jersey			X(1) (Not funded)	X(2)		(1) Teacher Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher
New Mexico			X(1)(2)			(1) Tiered Licensing (2) Mentor Teacher
New York	X(1)		X(2)(3)	X(4)		(1) Mentor Teacher (2) Teacher Incentive (3) Staff Development (4) School Incentive
North Carolina		X(1)	X(2)			(1) Career Ladder (2) Differentiated Pay
North Dakota	X				X	Career Development
Ohio		X		X		Career Ladder
Oklahoma	X					Teacher Incentive
Oregon				X		School Restructuring
Pennsylvania			X(1) X(2) X(3) (Not funded)			(1) Career Development (2) Mentor Teacher (3) School Incentive
Rhode Island		X			X	Mentor Teacher
South Carolina			X(1)	X(2)		(1) School Incentive (2) Campus Incentive
South Dakota	X			X		Mentor Teacher
Tennessee			X(1)	X(2)		(1) Career Ladder (2) School/Teacher Incentive
Texas			X			School Incentive
Utah			X			Career Ladder
Vermont						
Virginia	X(2)	X(1)				(1) Mentor Teacher (2) Teacher Incentive
Washington		X(1)	X(2)			(1) School Incentive (2) Mentor Teacher
West Virginia			X			Mentor Teacher
Wisconsin	X(1)(2)				X(1)	(1) Mentor Teacher (2) Teacher Incentive
Wyoming	X					Teacher Incentive

Southern Regional Education Board

Survey of State Actions

Alabama

The Alabama Performance-Based Career Incentive Program of 1985 was never implemented and was repealed in a 1988 law. New evaluation systems for teachers and administrators in the state were developed later.

The Alabama Professional Education Personnel Evaluation Program addresses the resolution adopted by the State Board of Education in July 1988 and the Alabama Education Improvement Act passed by the legislature in 1991. The program establishes policies and procedures which require the implementation of an evaluation system based on state criteria for improving the performance of all professional education personnel.

Numerous Alabama educators have participated in the development of criteria, provided input into the preparation of various parts of the evaluation systems, and assisted in the piloting and field-testing of the program.

Although performance evaluation will ultimately be required of all education personnel employed in the public schools of Alabama, the initial development and implementation efforts have focused on school administrators. Since January of 1991, the following have been accomplished or are underway.

- The evaluation program for administrators was field-tested in 25 school systems and streamlined.
- Twenty-two school systems chose the option of implementing their own locally-developed evaluation systems.
- During the summer and fall of 1992, statewide training sessions were held for the 79 school systems not yet trained in the administrator evaluation system.
- During the 1991-92 school year, State Department staff, working in conjunction with consultants, completed development of the evaluation plan for classroom teachers. The teacher system was pilot-tested in April of 1992.
- Evaluation systems for specialty areas of employment, i.e., guidance counselors, library-media specialists, etc., are currently under development.
- The evaluation criteria are now being used to develop a professional development program for administrators that is linked directly to the evaluation results. This same linkage will apply to all personnel as the evaluation program is fully implemented. This is a unique feature of the Alabama Program and is a significant part of state efforts to restructure public education.
- The administrator evaluation systems are being fully implemented during the 1993-94 school year, including evaluation of local superintendents.

In March 1993, the courts declared Alabama's public schools inadequate and their funding inequitable. This was in response to an equity funding lawsuit brought by 28 of the state's poorest school systems. The judge ordered a "remedy plan" to be developed by October 1, 1993. The Governor's Education Reform Task Force was appointed to develop the plan. As a result of

that plan, legislation is being considered to reform the Alabama education system. The plans under consideration focus on defining results for students, developing new assessment programs for students, revising the infrastructure, and having a strong accountability system with rewards, sanctions, and assistance to schools.

Alaska

In Alaska, local school districts are authorized to establish career ladder programs for their teachers. Local career ladders are normally based on educational credits, degrees, and longevity.

The Alaska legislature and the State Board of Education initiated several efforts to involve teachers in shaping educational programs. Legislation passed in 1990 requires schools and school districts to report on their performance to the public. In 1991, the State Board of Education adopted the Alaska 2000 Education Initiative that includes the idea of promoting and rewarding improved teaching practices.

Annually, the State Department of Education sponsors training programs for teachers to improve their teaching skills. These include summer staff development academies, mathematics and writing consortia, healthy life skills curricula development, suicide prevention programs, and training for working with at-risk students. Additionally, the department is continuing federally funded teacher incentive grants for developing classroom projects that have potential for use by other teachers.

Arizona

Early legislation in Arizona established a five-year career ladder pilot program and authorized a joint legislative committee to be involved with the approval and monitoring of pilot districts. The locally designed pilot programs were developed in consultation with teachers. Criteria for the projects included procedures that stressed assessment of teacher performance, a compensation system based completely on a restructured salary schedule rather than merit raises on top of a base salary schedule, evidence of teacher support, and a way to evaluate student achievement. Fourteen districts originally took part in the pilot program. In 1988-89, funding for the program was $13.8 million. Funding grew steadily from 1990 ($18.4 million) to 1993 ($24.3 million).

As a result of gains in student achievement within the pilot districts, the legislature passed a law in 1990 to expand the program. Seven new districts were added beginning in 1992-93. As required by the law, oversight has shifted from the legislature to the State Board of Education, and a statewide advisory committee consisting of legislators, personnel from the original pilot districts, and community members has been formed. Based on findings from the pilot project, program requirements for new districts contained additions to the pilot guidelines—all teachers new to a district were required to participate, differentiated evaluation criteria were developed for various levels of the ladder, multiple evaluators were used, and teachers reaching the top rungs of the ladder were required to take on additional instructional responsibilities. In addition, district readiness to implement a career ladder program was considered in the approval process. The new guidelines were not required for the original pilot districts; however, incentives were available for those districts that incorporated the new ideas.

Legislation passed in 1992 removed the requirement that all teachers participate, making program participation voluntary—teachers are either paid on a traditional salary schedule or on the career ladder. Additionally, further expansion of the program was authorized beginning in 1993-94 and another eight districts initiated career ladders bringing the total to 29 districts. Further expansion of the program is possible if funding is provided.

During the 1993 legislative session, career ladder funding was threatened as a part of a statewide cost-cutting package which would have abolished the program over two years. A compromise saved the program from elimination by initiating a shift from state funding to local funding over three years beginning 1993-94. In the current year, the program is operating with an estimated $26.4 million including state support of $19.1 million (down from $24.3 million last year) and local funding at $7.2 million. Legislation considered during the regular session called for restoring full state funding and providing additional funds to allow more districts to participate. Funding was not restored, but the second and third steps to phase-out state support have been delayed. In 1995, funding will remain at the current level.

In 1993-94, nearly $921,000 was provided for the fourth and final year of 15 school restructuring pilot projects. The pilots focused on six goal areas including increasing parental involvement, enriching the school environment, improving academic achievement, and improving professionalism and cooperation among teachers. Evaluations of the projects revealed that the pilot schools most often emphasized site-based decision-making, utilizing technology, parental involvement, and staff development in their restructuring efforts. Barriers to effectiveness were found to include the lack of preparation of central offices to allow the schools to operate with autonomy and the difficulty that principals had in shifting from being a decision-maker to a facilitator. Also, tradition was a significant barrier "since most schools were entrenched in their ways of governance, delivery of instructional programs, and defined roles of parents, teachers, and students." Proposed legislation addresses decentralization and school councils, among other reform efforts.

Arkansas

Legislation passed in 1991, "Meeting the National Education Goals: Schools for Arkansas' Future," provides for the development of a 10-year plan for restructuring the education system. Emphasis is on integrating statewide curriculum frameworks, performance assessment tools, and professional development programs. The State Board of Education has adopted learner outcomes and a task force is in the process of designing and implementing an outcome-based licensure system for teachers and administrators. The Arkansas Academy for Leadership Training and School-Based Management has been established to provide a variety of training programs and opportunity to develop the knowledge base and leadership skills of principals, as well as teachers, superintendents and other administrators, and school board members. The legislation also provides grants for up to $20,000 for planning and/or professional development activities for schools and districts involved in the restructuring process.

The school year 1994-95 marked the opening of the Arkansas School for Mathematics and Sciences, legislated in 1991, for the purpose of educating the gifted and talented math and science students of the state and to develop curriculum and materials to improve instruction in mathematics and science for all students in the state.

Arkansas is involved with the Middle Grade School State Policy Initiative, for which three Arkansas schools are currently funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. They are

engaged in the curriculum, instruction, and assessment component. The state's self-study process, "Comprehensive Outcomes Evaluation," recognized by the North Central Association for Accreditation, is based on site-based management and encourages restructuring.

The Governor's K-3 Initiative, accompanied by 1993 legislation, put in place quality summer enrichment programs for K-3 students who are below grade level. Training is funded for all school teams, including teachers and principals, who are involved in the summer enrichment programs.

California

The California Mentor Teacher Program, created in 1983, is intended to improve the quality of classroom instruction by using the expertise of exemplary teachers for the support of both new and experienced teachers. Mentor responsibilities include providing assistance and guidance to new teachers along with designing and implementing staff and curriculum development for teachers in general.

The mentor teachers are selected locally for a period of up to three years by committees composed of a majority of teachers. Program incentives include recognition of teaching excellence, opportunities to improve the professional environment and to function in leadership roles, and an annual stipend of approximately $4,000.

The legislation establishing the Mentor Program allows considerable latitude to districts in designing, implementing, and evaluating their individual programs. Districts electing to participate in the Mentor Program are allocated the funds necessary to support up to 5 percent of the eligible teachers as mentors.

The program has grown steadily in its ten years, and state funding remains fairly consistent despite difficult economic times. Currently, more than 11,000 mentors work in a variety of professional development roles. Funding for 1993-94 (approximately $68 million) will provide each mentor with the stipend and districts will receive approximately $2,000 per mentor to offset the costs of selection and training and for release time and materials to support the mentors' work with other teachers.

Colorado

As a part of Colorado's Educational Quality Act of 1985, 20 pilot projects researched and tested career ladder, mentor teacher, career enrichment, and performance incentive programs. The Department of Education's final report in August 1987 concluded that a statewide approach to incentives was not feasible. It recommended that the state coordinate guidelines for local districts to develop teacher recognition and compensation programs.

Legislation passed during the 1988 session allows local districts to design and implement pilot programs establishing alternative salary policies. The Department of Education reviews proposals submitted by the districts and provides assistance to districts implementing programs. No state funds have been provided for this purpose—districts participating must finance the alternative salary policies from existing operating funds.

The Excellent Schools Program, also established in 1988, is to provide financial awards to personnel, schools, and districts that demonstrate outstanding performance in achieving

established goals. No state funds have been appropriated for the program; however, the Department of Education is authorized to receive contributions to fund the financial awards. Schools have been recognized by the State Board of Education for outstanding performance, but no monetary awards have been made.

Following recommendations of the Teacher Employment and Compensation Committee created in 1990 legislation, the 1991 Educator Licensing Act established a three-tiered system of licensure for all educators. Scheduled to go into effect July 1994, educators will be licensed as provisional, professional, or (voluntary) master. Two professional standards boards have been working for more than a year to set standards for preservice programs, provisional licensure, induction programs that are required for provisional licensees, professional licenses, license renewal, and master certification.

While "pay for performance" was discussed at the time the Educator Licensing Act was passed, no provisions for differentiated pay were included. Proposed legislation now being considered would require that performance be one of the factors used in determining teacher pay. Several school districts are exploring alternative pay structures, some of which may correspond with the three levels of licensure.

Connecticut

In 1987, the governor signed a law addressing increases in minimum teacher salaries, professional development, teacher evaluation, and teacher career incentives. Grants totaling $2 million were provided over a two-year period (1988 and 1989) to develop new or revise existing teacher evaluation programs and to plan teacher career incentive programs. Also in 1989, $3 million was provided to implement teacher evaluation programs. In 1990, $1 million was available for professional development grants, which allowed some districts to continue their programs with state support.

The Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) program, now in its fifth year, is an induction program for beginning teachers that provides support through mentorship. Through classroom performance assessments, BEST also ensures that beginning teachers have mastered the essential teaching skills necessary to be eligible for the next level of certification.

Professional growth opportunities are available to experienced teachers and administrators. More than 8,000 classroom teachers and administrators (nearly one-fourth of the state's professional staff) have undergone extensive training as mentors to support beginning teachers, and as assessors to determine the competency level expected of novice teachers.

Recently a panel of distinguished educators and private industry representatives were invited to re-examine the BEST program. The panel's preliminary work recognizes a vision which links teaching with learning, focuses on student outcomes, and redefines the role of the teacher as a facilitator of learning.

To implement this vision, alternative assessment studies are being piloted in the areas of special education and mathematics, with English, science and social studies to be added in the near future. Portfolios and structured interviews are several of the alternative assessment strategies being explored, and beginning teachers support models to compliement these new forms of assessment are under consideration.

Delaware

Early efforts in Delaware focused on career ladder and other incentive programs. Funds were appropriated in 1985 for the development and implementation of a career ladder program. When agreement on a program could not be reached, the funds were used to develop teacher training models and to implement a statewide appraisal system. The focus then turned to professional development for teachers and principals. Teachers are trained in the elements of effective teaching; principals, in supervision and evaluation fundamentals and in the elements of effective schools. A statewide policy for appraising school-level administrators was adopted by the State Board of Education in July 1990.

Florida

Incentive programs for teachers and administrators include the Teacher of the Year Program, in which the state winner receives $2,500 from state funds and $10,000 from Burdines, corporate sponsor of the program. Regional winners were awarded $1,250 from the state and $5,000 from Burdines. District winners receive $500 from the state and $750 from Burdines.

The Ida S. Baker Distinguished Minority Educator Recognition Award honors outstanding minority teachers and administrators in Florida's public school system and postsecondary institutions. The winner and two runners-up receive a monetary award and plaque from the corporate sponsor, Shearson Lehman Brothers.

The Florida School-Related Employee of the Year program honors outstanding school and district office personnel such as teacher-aides, janitors, cafeteria staff, secretaries, and office managers. Four regional winners are awarded $500 from the state with the School-Related Employee of the Year receiving $1,000. District finalists receive a $200 state award.

The Florida Commissioner of Education created the Principal Achievement Award Program in 1989. Principals are chosen on the basis of criteria of excellence, that include increasing student performance; encouraging positive, innovative teaching; working with the school advisory council; utilizing community resources; and creating a positive school climate. The 1992-93 awards went to 15 principals, three from each of Florida's five regions. No funds are associated with these awards, but the Commissioner of Education approved the establishment of a Principal's Hall of Fame in the Florida Education Center. The awards are underwritten through a business partnership with the Holden Group, a Florida firm.

District Incentive Programs

Teachers, parents, and community members in many Florida school districts, including Dade County, are being offered intensive in-service training in facilitative leadership, improving communications skills, curriculum reform, and innovative instructional strategies. Since schools are moving toward endorsing school-based management strategies, they have the flexibility to develop school-based teacher incentive programs.

At the district level, the 1991 through 1994 contract between the Dade County Public Schools and the United Teachers of Dade continues many initiatives implemented in the landmark agreement of 1988. The 1991 contract continues the trend begun in 1974 to move

toward school-based management and shared decision-making at the school level. The Professionalization of Teaching Task Force remains an important joint union/administration vehicle for addressing these issues. Examples of the application of school-based management and shared decision-making contained in this contract are provisions for expanded participation of parents and students in the decision-making process, the implementation of an alternative supplement model for the 1992-93 school year, and the development of a pilot Peer Intervention and Assistance Program. During the 1991-92 school year, 151 schools participated in the initiative. The teachers' union and the school board have agreed to waive district rules or contract provisions, if necessary. The current labor contract contains over 150 such waivers. In addition, the district continues to expand its Satellite Learning Centers, facilities built and paid for by business and organizations on their premises to serve the educational needs of their employees' children. These centers are staffed by Dade County Public Schools and are supervised through a host school, but on-site supervision is provided by a lead teacher.

School Improvement and Accountability

In 1991, the Florida legislature passed a school improvement and accountability bill, *Blueprint 2000*, initiating a program of restructuring and reform that returns the responsibility for education to those closest to the students—the schools, teachers, and parents. The Florida Commission on Education Reform and Accountability was organized to provide guidelines and recommendations regarding *Blueprint 2000* components and requirements.

Beginning in September 1992, each school in the state needed to have a School Advisory Council comprised of an ethnically balanced ratio of members, including students, parents, community members, teachers, and the principal of that school. School Improvement Plans, written with assistance from this School Advisory Council and approved by the local school board, were implemented by September 1993.

Each School Improvement Plan must address the seven (7) outcome-based State Education Goals of Florida as set forth in *Blueprint 2000*. The goals call for improvement in the following areas: readiness to start school, graduation rate and readiness for postsecondary education and employment, student performance, learning environment, school safety and environment, teachers and staff, and adult literacy. In three years, those schools not showing adequate progress toward meeting their stated goals and objectives will receive district intervention and assistance. Schools showing improvement will be recognized through incentives offered at both the local and statewide levels. These incentives may recognize outstanding teachers, curriculum and instructional restructuring, business partnerships, or other areas of improvement and achievement as determined by local school boards and the Florida Commission on Education Reform and Accountability.

Florida School Report

The *Florida School Report* is part of the Florida Improvement and Accountability Act passed in 1991, which requires the Commissioner of Education to report in writing to the public on the current status of the state educational system.

The Florida School Report is a status report of each of the 2,576 public schools in 67 school districts. The purpose of the report is to provide information to school advisory committees on the needs of the school to aid the committee in developing a School Improvement Plan and to inform the public. The legislation also requires each school board to distribute copies of the

report to the parents of all pupils in the districts. The first school report was distributed fall 1992. Annual reports will be distributed each year.

Data are presented on three levels: school, district, and state. Information is by racial/ethnic category and gender when appropriate. Examples of the kinds of information contained in the report are student (enrollment, student attendance rate, and dropouts); staff/teacher (degree level and years of experience); test scores; and sources of revenue. Individual schools are encouraged to add school-specific information to the report.

New Assessment Methods

The Department of Education is working in partnership with the Assessment Committee of the Florida Commission on Education Reform and Accountability to plan, develop, and implement new ways to measure what students know. *Blueprint 2000* envisions the use of different ways of assessing knowledge that are closer to the instructional activities that take place in classrooms. For example, students may be asked to write brief answers to open-ended questions. Or teachers might ask students to design, conduct, and explain a science experiment, or write about how they solved the mathematical problems associated with designing a fence. This vision of new assessment methods seeks to move education in Florida to a higher level of student knowledge and skill—one in which students can routinely produce information, perform tasks, and demonstrate knowledge. Many Florida school districts will become partners in working on specific projects that create, use, and revise, if necessary, the new assessment methods.

The Department is also working with several national groups to develop assessment methods that can be used as models for testing in Florida or, possibly, as tests of nationally accepted student outcomes or standards. One of these projects, sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers, is developing alternative approaches to measure outcomes in science. A second project in which Florida is a participant, the New Standards Project, is pilot testing creative methods for evaluating reading, writing, and mathematics.

Florida Writes!

The new student writing assessment program, *Florida Writes!*, is an important step toward the vision of *Blueprint 2000*. *Florida Writes!* meets the *Blueprint 2000* Goal 3 requirements that call for the development and implementation of assessment methods to evaluate student performance standards and outcomes that cannot be assessed using tests we now have. It provides one indicator of an important student skill that can be compared across Florida schools. In 1994, all students in grades 4, 8, and 10 will participate in this assessment.

Georgia

The Georgia Career Ladder Program, developed in response to 1985 legislation, was piloted in five systems during the 1988-89 school year. Funding for implementation in 32 school systems was sought in the 1990 General Assembly; however, no funds were appropriated. In 1991, the governor established a Task Force on Teacher Pay for Performance. That group developed a program which would provide bonuses for all faculty in schools demonstrating school-wide excellence. Legislation based on the Pay for Performance Task Force recommendations was introduced and passed in the 1992 legislative session. It directed the State Board of Education to develop and implement the program, including the establishment of

criteria for evaluating proposals for exemplary performance at school sites. Criteria for awards relate to student achievement, other school program benefits and progress in meeting the six national goals for education.

Individual schools make application through their school system to the Georgia Department of Education. Schools which develop an approved application and accomplish the performance objectives set forth in their application become eligible for a monetary award which may be used as the school faculty decides. Their options include using the money for salary bonuses to staff or for program improvement within the school.

In January 1993, school system superintendents were notified that individual schools were invited to apply. Sixty-seven applications were received and, after a thorough review, 18 school applications were approved. Each of the schools will submit a performance report by June 15, 1994, and schools meeting their objectives will be eligible for an award. The State board of Education has requested fiscal year 1995 funds for $2,000 per certificated staff member in the eligible schools. Awards to eligible schools will be made in the fall of 1994. Increased funding has been proposed by the Governor.

A report released in 1991 by a University System of Georgia Review Committee on Teacher Preparation called for an outcome-based approach to teacher preparation and licensing, with development of new and improved assessments of knowledge and skills of teachers. The recommendations urged that teachers be viewed in changing roles—mentor, coach, tutor—and less often viewed as a lecturer. It also called for teachers to be part of assessment teams and training. Programs are under development.

A Teacher Induction/Mentor-Teacher Stipends Program has been funded for 1994 with $1,000,000. Funding is expected at $1.5 million for fiscal year 1995. The program provides assistance to teachers in their first three years of service with plans to extend to teachers new to their position or system. Mentors are experienced teachers who must complete a certification endorsement program of 10 quarter-hours of college credit or staff development units. Several school systems are expanding the program through additional local funds. In fiscal year 1992, 1,500 mentors and beginning teachers participated. In fiscal year 1994, 2,000 beginning teachers will be served. Programs are being designed to refine instructional and classroom management skills of teachers and provide continued professional growth.

Hawaii

A number of programs implemented in Hawaii have offered incentives for teachers and school administrators. The state-supported alternative/special certification program, originally limited to mathematics and science, has been extended to address teacher shortages in special education, school counseling, school library services, and Hawaiian Language Immersion. The program allows current teachers and persons with undergraduate degrees to seek certification in shortage areas. The programs are developed and implemented by the State Department of Education in conjunction with the College of Education, University of Hawaii at Manoa. The newest program implemented provides a "stability" incentive of $4,000 to principals for each five years they remain at a single school. Hawaii also sponsors teacher exchange programs with other states and currently with Koshigaye, Japan, and Brussels, Belgium, to provide teachers with new professional development opportunities.

The State Department of Education is implementing a statewide mentor teacher program which provides departmental credits for the mentor that may be applied toward salary reclassification. Two credits per semester may be earned. Professional development schools are intended to simultaneously strengthen pre-service teacher education programs and school renewal. Both initiatives are currently being implemented using existing resources.

Other initiatives that encourage professional growth include staff development programs for teachers and administrators, which are funded at nearly $1.5 million. The funds are prorated to districts based upon teacher units; individual schools then submit development plans to the districts for funding. An education-business partnership effort places teachers and school administrators in four-week summer internships at local businesses where they can acquire new job perspectives and skills in planning, staff development, and community relations. The interns are paid $1,500 by the businesses for their participation.

The Cohort School Leadership Program, implemented in September 1990, annually places 40 teachers in a one-year, on-the-job school administration intern program. Course credit requirements are completed during the internship and participants are given the opportunity to earn a master's degree in Educational Administration. The program emphasizes field-based learning and uses a case studies approach.

A business-education partnership effort has resulted in the establishment of the Hawaii School Recognition Program. Frito-Lay of Hawaii provides cash awards to honor schools demonstrating outstanding performance in achieving established goals. Elementary schools were recognized in 1991; secondary schools were recognized in 1992.

Over 50 percent of Hawaii's schools are now involved in school- and community- based management, which empowers teachers, school administrators, classified staff, students, parents, and community members to make collaborative decisions that impact student learning. It is intended to give schools greater flexibility and shifts a significant degree of decision-making authority from the state and district to the school community.

Idaho

Idaho enacted legislation in 1984 that permitted school districts to participate in the Teacher Excellence Program; $100,000 was appropriated for administration and assistance to local districts in developing career compensation plans in the 1985 fiscal year, with the expectation that these plans would be implemented during the following year. While the 1985 legislature did not appropriate the funding for local career compensation plans due to economic considerations, $90,000 was provided to the State Department of Education to continue a local district assistance program, with a verbal commitment to address the career ladder issue in upcoming legislative sessions.

The 1989 legislature did address the issue by appropriating a one-time $3 million for programs that attract and retain quality teachers. The funds were to be used to support a minimum teacher salary of $16,000, to implement career compensation plans developed as a result of the 1985 funding, and for the development and implementation of compensation plans in those districts that did not have such plans. Because the salaries of so many teachers fell below the $16,000 minimum, the funding was used to raise salaries. Approximately 25 of the state's 113 school districts developed career compensation plans after the legislature's actions in 1985; however, no other districts have submitted plans to the Department of Education for

approval. The Career Ladder/Excellence provision remains in law though no further funding has been made available.

The 1993 legislature eliminated the teacher mentor program that had been in place for four years. Under the program, districts had received $1,000 for each first-year certified person employed.

Idaho has a School Reform Committee and a Goals and Testing Committee which continue to move Idaho ahead for a Schools 2000 implementation. These reform efforts address outcome education, statewide goals, and provide funding for pilot grants for innovative school projects. The reform efforts have allowed for significant impact in local schools—by local instructional groups, in spite of reduced statewide funding.

Illinois

The Illinois Education Reform Act of 1986 authorized the establishment of a Center for Excellence in Teaching within the State Board of Education to conduct a study of teacher career compensation programs based on merit. The State Board of Education was authorized to fund five to seven pilot programs in local districts; $1 million was allocated for the implementation phase during 1986-87.

The pilot programs were designed to identify, from an array of various types, compensation programs that the General Assembly might then extend on a statewide basis. Proposals were solicited from all Illinois school districts; 30 proposals were received, all of which were developed by the school districts in conjunction with their teachers and a participating university. In March 1986 seven districts were awarded grants to continue developing plans for implementation. Funding for the pilots was scaled down in 1987-88—$800,000 supported the continuation of five of the pilots. The same five continued during 1988-89 with $600,000. No further funding has been provided.

Indiana

A plan was developed in response to 1985 legislation requiring the Indiana State Department of Education to determine the feasibility of a career ladder plan and to develop methods to honor, recognize, and provide professional growth for teachers. The four-year Teacher Quality and Professional Improvement Program, completed in 1990, involved pilot projects primarily in career ladder and career development areas. Following the pilot projects, the Department concluded that local districts should be encouraged to develop and implement career ladder and career development programs based upon their individual needs. No direct state support is available, but some of the pilot projects have continued with local district support.

Beginning in 1988-89, all districts were required to have a mentor teacher program, in which new teachers participate as a condition for continued employment. Annually, $2 million has been appropriated to support the program. From these funds, mentor teachers are paid $600 per year and the districts receive $200 per mentor to provide release time.

Indiana has initiated a school incentive program authorized by the legislature in 1987. Schools receive cash awards for student improvement in at least two of four areas (performance on the state progress exam, language arts test scores, mathematics test scores, and

attendance rates). The 1988-89 appropriation of $10 million was distributed in the 1989-90 school year. The second $10 million appropriation was distributed in 1990-91. Funding since 1992 has remained at $4.9 million due to the economy.

Iowa

Iowa's Educational Excellence Program, created through legislation enacted in 1987, includes three "phases." The first two phases address recruiting and retaining quality teachers. Phase III involves improving the quality, effectiveness, and performance of teachers as well as school "transformation" for "real and fundamental change in the school system." Current funding is at $79.5 million, a decrease from the $80.3 million appropriated for 1993.

Phase I, funded at $11 million, maintains a minimum teacher salary of $18,000. The $42 million allocated for Phase II improves salaries of experienced teachers. Phase III, now funded at $25.5 million, promotes excellence through the development of performance-based pay plans and supplemental pay plans based on additional work assignments or specialized training. A 1990 amendment to the law added the idea of "comprehensive school transformation" to Phase III, which focuses on the improvement of student achievement and the attainment of student achievement goals.

Districts choosing to participate in Phase III submit performance-based pay plans, supplemental pay plans, or school transformation plans to the State Department of Education. School transformation plans may include providing salary increases to teachers who, for example:

- Implement site-based, shared decision making;
- Develop goal-oriented compensation plans at the school level;
- Focus on student outcomes;
- Work to coordinate health and social services; and
- Direct accountability efforts.

An evaluation of Phase III was released by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) in January 1992. The report concluded that Phase III is working and "has become the primary means for Iowa educators to implement reform and transformation efforts being called for at the national, state, and local levels." Noting the broad, open-ended nature of the original program and the expansion of the program in 1990, NCREL recommended the focus be narrowed to school transformation alone. Other recommendations included strengthening local accountability, strengthening state leadership, and stabilizing the funding.

Kansas

The Kansas State Board of Education and the legislature have adopted the position that teacher incentive programs should be developed and funded at the local level. A pilot internship program designed to improve the quality of teachers entering the profession was funded at $225,000 in 1988. No state funding has been provided since 1988-89.

Kentucky

Comprehensive legislation passed by the 1990 Kentucky General Assembly calls for measurable goals for schools that "define the outcomes expected of students." The intent of the law was that "schools succeed with all students," and that the state should provide rewards for schools showing improvement over a two-year period. Improving achievement, developing skills in communications and mathematics, being able to make a successful transition to work, reducing dropout rates, and becoming problem solvers are among the desired outcomes for students.

The Kentucky Board of Education has approved a formula for determining school success. In 1993 a baseline score was calculated for each school based on new tests given in 1992 and other indicators such as attendance and dropout scores. A threshold or minimum score each school will be expected to reach in two years was released. Each school is expected to reduce the gap between its current score and a score of 100 by 10 percent. The formula puts equal weight on five tested subject areas and a combined non-academic factor. Rewards will go to individual schools when gains are made. School staff will decide how the reward funds will be spent, but bonuses will not be added to base salary. Schools that do not reach threshold levels of performance will be required to develop school improvement plans, and ultimately, if performance is not improved, staff can be declared "in crisis" and placed on probation. Parents can then choose to transfer students to successful schools. The original timeline calling for rewards and sanctions to go into effect in 1994 is being discussed. The intent is to provide additional time for changes in schools to occur.

The legislation also called for Kentucky Distinguished Educators to be chosen to assist the State Department of Education with projects and work with schools in crisis. Distinguished Educators receive comprehensive training to enable them to work with schools that are not meeting standards. The law also called for a Kentucky Professional Compensation Plan to be developed. The plan is to have advancement opportunities based on professional skills with consideration of education, rank, years of service, length of work year, and performance. The law also calls for school-based decision making. All schools must have school-site management in place by 1996.

Louisiana

Louisiana's 1988 legislation, the "Children First" education reform package, called for two incentive programs—the School Profile and Incentive Program and the Model Career Options Program.

School Progress Profiles, approved by the Board of Education are prepared annually on every school and school system. Data collection began with the 1989-90 school year, and the second profile reports on each school and district have been issued. The individual school reports for parents and the public include information on test results, class size, faculty qualification, student dropouts, attendance, suspensions and expulsions.

The School Incentive Program (funded at $150,000 in 1991-92 for the third year of development) was designed to reward schools making significant progress on Progress Profile indicators. The pilot phase continued through 1991-92 to test the standards for selecting award recipients. Some 50 schools received cash awards, with another 300 schools receiving flags and certificates. (Schools are grouped into similar categories based on such factors as the

socioeconomic status of students, the size of the school, and the urban or suburban location.) The cash awards will be used for instruction, not to increase salaries. School councils of teachers, community members, and students will assist the principals in determining the use of the award. This program has been discontinued temporarily due to lack of funding.

The Model Career Options Program (MCOP) provides teachers with salary bonuses for performance and advancement and with opportunities to take on new and expanded responsibilities, as well as providing districts with additional services using talented teachers. A statewide committee developed the program. The MCOP legislation was amended in the 1993 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature so that the compensation each participating MCOP teacher receives "shall be in an amount based upon the actual appropriation each year by the legislature." The General Appropriations Act of the 1993 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature included no funds for the MCOP; therefore, the MCOP was not funded for the 1993-94 school year. A request for funding for the 1994-95 school year is being submitted by the Louisiana Department of Education.

The Teacher Mentor Program was first authorized through state legislation for the 1992-93 school year as a pilot program. During the 1992-93 school year, 24 teachers in 24 sites throughout the state served as mentors to first-year teachers in their respective schools. Each mentor teacher received $2,041.66 in additional pay, with an additional amount up to $850 allowed for travel expenses to attend state-sponsored professional development training in mentoring.

However, the Teacher Mentor Program was not funded statewide for the 1993-94 school year. Consequently, the Teacher Mentor Program joined a group of other instructional programs and is now categorized under "Instructional Enhancement Programs," which is funded through the Louisiana Quality Education Fund (8g).

Parishes are given a predetermined amount of funds from which they can select and decide on which programs of the "Instructional Enhancement" group they desire to spend their monies. Participation in the Teacher Mentor Program may or may not be selected by the individual parishes. Approximately five school systems opted to participate, which will impact an estimated 74 schools.

Mentors must meet the following qualifications:

1) Be willing and able to serve as a mentor to any new teacher;

2) Hold a regular Louisiana teaching certificate;

3) Have taught for a minimum of 10 years in the public schools in Louisiana;

4) Have taught a minimum of three years in the system;

5) Hold a master's degree;

6) Have successfully completed at least a three credit hour college course in supervision of instruction or supervision of student teaching; and

7) Be certified to teach in the same areas as the new teacher to be assisted.

Each mentor/new teacher pair collaboratively develops an action plan to guide their mentoring efforts. A team from each local school system, including mentor, new teacher, and principal, will evaluate the success of the program.

Maine

Legislation adopted in 1988 established three levels of certification—a two-year provisional certificate for beginning teachers, a renewable five-year professional certificate, and a master teacher certificate. Under the law, beginning teachers serving the two-year provisional term were supervised and evaluated by support systems consisting primarily of teachers; evaluation criteria included professional classroom skills and subject matter knowledge. After successfully completing the provisional term, the teachers were granted the professional certificate.

The State Board of Education adopted procedures for the statewide implementation of the certification program, standards for the support systems, and a process for appeals pertaining to applications for the issuance and renewal of certificates. The certification program took effect on July 1, 1988. All districts now have support systems that are providing the State Department of Education with recommendations for certification renewals.

All professional level certificate holders have the opportunity to apply for a master level certificate based on a locally developed process. Currently, there are about 180 master teachers statewide (out of a total of 12,000 teachers). Local districts determine the level of additional pay, if any, for master teachers.

Due to economic conditions, some certification requirements have been temporarily relaxed. Districts now have the option to assign a single mentor to beginning teachers rather than a support team. Additionally, to ease the workload of the district support systems, the State Department of Education will renew certificates *without* their recommendations. These options have been requested by less than 5 percent of the school units in Maine.

Maryland

Incentive programs continue to be based primarily at the local level. However, in keeping with the major goals adopted in 1991 by the Maryland State Board of Education for its Schools for Success initiative, the State Department of Education has been planning to improve the quality of beginning teachers by moving toward the inclusion of performance assessment criteria in teacher preparation programs leading to initial certification. The criteria are tied to a validated core of Essential Teaching Knowledge expressed as outcomes. Appropriate models of performance assessment will be identified or developed in collaboration with higher education as well as through research on outcomes-based models for teacher performance.

The State Board of Education and the Professional Standards and Teacher Education Board are investigating the connection that should exist between recertification and evidence of lifelong learning and continuous professional growth. Several ideas are being considered by the Board for possible inclusion in a new policy. These include acknowledging experienced teachers' contributions to the profession as mentors, cooperating teachers, researchers, developers, and writers by crediting these services toward re-licensing.

The Maryland School Performance Program is being implemented over several years. The fourth year of report cards have just been issued, with data available on a school-by-school basis. Data include assessed knowledge, student attendance, and yearly dropout and promotion rates. Supporting information, such as student population characteristics, is also provided. Ratings of excellent, satisfactory, or standard-not-yet-met are noted for each category. The Maryland State Board of Education adopted standards for schools and procedures to

identify and intervene in schools that can consistently fail to make progress in meeting the standards. High school and middle schools will be identified based on attendance, dropout rates, and achievement test results. The Maryland School Performance Program, which began in 1990, requires schools to plan and implement school improvement programs.

Massachusetts

Education reform legislation passed in 1993 calls for the development of standards and accountability at the state, district, and school level. The state is in the process of identifying what students should know and be able to do so that curriculum frameworks and new assessments can be developed in the future. Accountability provisions of the law call for the State Department of Education to identify schools and districts that are performing well and to provide technical assistance to those which are underperforming. It is recognized that a school's ability to assist students in reaching high standards depends on the quality of the instructional staff. The Education Reform Act requires teachers to participate in ongoing professional development throughout their careers. Schools and districts will be responsible for establishing professional development plans and performance standards.

New teacher certification requirements will become effective in October 1994. Under the new regulations, a provisional certificate will be awarded with the completion of a bachelor's degree in liberal arts and successful performance on communication and subject area tests set by the State Board of Education. Teachers with provisional certification can then enter district-based support and evaluation through which they may be approved for "advanced standing." The provisional certificate with advanced standing, valid for five years, will be granted to graduates of approved programs at colleges and universities or other programs approved by the Commissioner of Education. Also valid for five years, standard certification depends upon completion of a clinical master's degree or an equivalent program approved by the Commissioner. Each district is required to submit a plan to the State Department of Education which details how the district will support, supervise, and evaluate their educators.

Michigan

Fiscal uncertainty is a major concern for educators in Michigan. In 1993, the legislature abolished the use of property taxes to fund schools effective in 1994-95. Voters will decide in March on increasing sales taxes to fund schools.

Legislation passed in Michigan in 1990 requires all public schools to develop and adopt three-year to five-year school improvement plans that could include teacher incentives. These plans are written and implemented by broad-based school and district teams, thus creating new roles for teachers and principals. Schools are also required to report to the public annually on the status of the school, adopt a core curriculum as a means of raising academic standards and improving school accountability, and become accredited by the State Board of Education. To support this effort in 1993-94, $5.3 million was appropriated for grants. Funding in 1993 was $4.5 million and in 1992, $2.4 million was available. Additionally, $25 per pupil is available through the finance formula for extra assistance to less wealthy districts implementing the requirements of the law.

For 1989-90 and 1990-91, a total of $4 million supported 41 pilot projects designed to improve student outcomes through restructuring the organization, roles, and relationships of the

school. No funding is currently available for the projects due to economic constraints though a number of schools are seeking other sources of funding to continue.

Minnesota

In 1987 the Minnesota legislature passed a law encouraging school districts to participate in a competitive grant program to implement new teacher mentorship programs. The purpose of the program is to examine the needs of probationary teachers—new to the teaching profession or new to the district; improve teaching skills and instructional performance; assist probationary teachers to assimilate into the culture of the school, district and community; promote professional and personal growth/development; and retain highly qualified teachers in the teaching profession. In 1993, the legislation was expanded to include experienced teachers in need of peer coaching. More specifically, the program provides:

- Grant funding, resources, and services to develop and expand monitoring programs in schools or districts;
- Statewide and regional training to support mentoring purposes; and
- Networking opportunities and on-site support.

In each of the 1987-89 and the 1989-91 bienniums, $500,000 was appropriated for mentor teacher grants. Eleven sites were selected as demonstration sites to design, develop, implement, and evaluate a variety of mentorship models. The sites reflected a variety of coalitions with higher education institutions, foundations, teacher centers, or the private sector. They were expected to disseminate materials and provide training to other schools interested in developing or expanding a teacher mentor program.

Beginning in 1989 and continuing through 1993, mini-grants were available to other schools, districts, and coalitions interested in adopting a teacher mentor program. The Department of Education provides up to five days of training in mentoring and coaching strategies to support start-up efforts and ongoing professional development for mentors and coordinators. The legislature has appropriated $650,000 for the 1993-95 biennium to continue grant funding and assistance to schools.

Mississippi

Legislation passed in Mississippi in 1991 called for a statewide Mentor Teacher Program for first-year teachers. The project got underway as a joint effort of the State Department of Education and a university in the state to develop and pilot a program and was to be implemented depending on availability of funding. It has not yet been funded.

All teachers must go through a state board evaluation process at least once and meet proficiency standards to receive pay raises. In addition, all teachers are evaluated annually by local districts. The state trains and certifies persons to serve as evaluators in these systems. Districts use either the state-developed model or the state competencies and guidelines for developing local plans. Incentive programs that were included in 1990 legislation have not been implemented because funding has not been available.

Missouri

The 1992-93 school year will mark the eighth year of the Missouri Career Ladder Program established by the Excellence in Education Act of 1985. The program has experienced steady growth since its inception. Both districts and teachers voluntarily participate in the three-step program; however, districts electing to participate must guarantee local funds to supplement a state allocation to reach the specified salary supplement levels of $1,500 for Stage I, $3,000 for Stage II, and $5,000 for Stage III. Teachers qualify for the program based upon experience and classroom performance. They may progress on the Career Ladder by satisfactorily completing the previous step. Participation in the program requires the teacher to assume added responsibilities in the areas of professional growth, school/community involvement, and faculty collaboration.

The program began in 1986-87 with $2.6 million supporting 2,369 teachers, counselors, and librarians in 63 school districts. During 1992-93, 204 districts and 8,536 teachers participated in the program. Twenty-six percent of the teachers participating were in Stage I, 34 percent in Stage II, and 40 percent in Stage III. The state's portion of this variable match program was $18.9 million.

Legislation passed in 1993 expanded the career ladder program to allow additional certified employees such as school psychologists, special education diagnosticians, and speech pathologists to participate. Previously, only classroom teachers, librarians, and guidance counselors were eligible for the program.

Projections for 1993-94 indicate that 229 districts and 10,500 teachers and other eligible persons will participate with a budget of $26 million. While many programs included in the 1985 reform legislation remain inactive due to lack of funding, the Career Ladder Program remains fully funded.

Montana

During 1985-86, Montana implemented a program to identify teachers with the potential of becoming principals and to assist these teachers in completing certification requirements. The selected teachers may act in the capacity of principal under supervision for a period of up to three years while working toward certification. A similar program was initiated in 1987-88 for those certified teachers seeking endorsement for special education. While completing the requirements, a person may teach in special education under supervision for up to one year. In 1988-89, a program for teachers interested in becoming guidance counselors was introduced.

The 1991 legislature created a research fund for the Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council. One-half of all certification fees ($15 per certificate) are placed in this fund, which should accumulate $78,000 per year. The Council is using a portion of this fund to implement a pilot mentorship (beginning teacher support) program in 15 locations across the state. The program began in the fall of 1992. After the initial year of planning, the 15 sites will implement these plans during 1994 and 1995. The Department of Education is to report to the legislature on the pilots in 1995. A proposal now under consideration would allocate $50,000 from the research fund for mini-grants of up to $5,000 for research projects that would add to the knowledge and professional preparation of educators.

Nebraska

Provisions for a career ladder were enacted by the Nebraska legislature in 1984 as part of the governor's omnibus education improvement bill. The legislature postponed the implementation date twice. In 1987 legislation, the implementation date was removed from law and a provision was added that made initiation of the program dependent upon funding. Funding has not been provided to the State Department of Education for development and implementation of the program. The statute relating to the career ladder was repealed by the 1990 legislature.

Nevada

The Department of Education initiated the statewide Nevada School Improvement Project in 1985. The program applies what is known from effective schools research over the past 20 years to improve schools. Initially, the process involves an entire school staff and students in assessing strengths and needs. Then a team of certified, classified, and administrative staff plans and implements goals and develops activities reflecting the mission of the school. They assume new leadership roles and develop a more collaborative working relationship with the principal and with their colleagues. The process used during the analysis and planning workshops assists teams in further developing collaboration and consensus-seeking skills. This project works in concert with other programs where the focus is on self-study and working together to accomplish goals. Currently about 25 percent of Nevada's schools are participating voluntarily.

The State Department of Education also sponsors the Educator Award Program in conjunction with the Milken Family Foundation. Each year six educators are selected by a committee of their peers for their demonstrated excellence as teachers, administrators, or other professionals who work directly with students. In addition to public recognition, each of the distinguished educators receives an award of $25,000 provided by the foundation.

The 1993 legislature passed two bills concerning site-based decision-making. One bill directs the State Board of Education to evaluate the feasibility of transferring responsibility for managerial decisions regarding public schools to staff, administrators and parents through a pilot project. The second bill authorizes local boards of trustees to prescribe rules regarding creation and administration of school-based decision-making programs and to request waivers of certain requirements. Neither bill included funding.

New Hampshire

The New Hampshire educational system is decentralized and is financed primarily with local funds. The State Board of Education has encouraged local districts to adopt compensation and incentive plans for teachers; however, any action taken is strictly a matter of local option. Currently, a few districts are experimenting with some form of incentive program. The State Board of Education is continuing to monitor their efforts.

New Jersey

Budget restraints are affecting a number of ongoing programs in New Jersey. While teachers are still guaranteed a minimum salary of $18,500, funding for several programs has

either been suspended or reduced. The Governor's Convocation on Excellence in Teaching (a teacher recognition program), the Commissioner's Symposium for Outstanding Teachers (a retreat where teachers and other educators exchange ideas), and the Minority Teacher Program (a financial aid program to attract minority students into teaching) received no funding.

The Governor's Teaching Scholars Program awards up to $30,000 scholarship loans to students interested in becoming teachers. Loans may be redeemed for teaching service. Previously awarded scholarship loans will continue, but again, no new funds are available for entering freshmen.

Beginning in September 1993, all new teachers were required to complete a one-year induction program. Experienced teachers serve as mentors and principals assess job performance before the state issues permanent teaching certificates to those who complete traditional teacher preparation programs. Mentoring has been required for the last seven years for students taking an "alternative route" to certification.

New Mexico

Teachers in New Mexico are licensed through a tiered system. The first level license, requiring a bachelor's degree and passage of the National Teaching Examination, is issued for up to three years. Level 2 requires satisfactory demonstration of State Board of Education teaching competencies. Teachers applying for a third level instructional license must hold a Master's degree and meet competencies for that level. Teachers possessing level 2 or level 3 licenses, which are approved for up to nine years, are eligible to serve as mentor teachers. The state published and distributed to districts suggested models for helping beginning teachers; districts were required to develop and adopt their plans by August 1989.

The State Board of Education has initiated CITE—Consolidating Initiatives for Tomorrow's Education—a student centered policy framework for educational change. Patterned around eight state goals, one emphasis is to "seek and reward excellence in teachers and other school personnel." Included among the initiatives is to expand professional development opportunities for teachers, improve the professional status of teachers with emphasis on professional rights and responsibilities, and support increasing salaries. Another goal addresses "decision making at the appropriate level" through the promotion of shared leadership and local control, restructuring at the state and local level, and focusing on educational outcomes.

New York

The legislature of New York has continued to fund a few programs designed to strengthen the teaching profession. In 1993-94, an appropriation of $52.9 million (up from $50.5 million) will provide teachers with salary increases based on their length of service. The Teacher Opportunity Corps, funded at $1.1 million in its seventh year of operation, attracts potential teachers into working with "at risk" students. The legislature reinstituted funding for 115 Teacher Resource and Computer Training Centers during 1992-93. For 1993-94, $12 million is supporting these centers which offer staff development activities for teachers in both public and non-public schools. Programs not receiving funding include the Teacher Summer Business Employment program, which provided incentives to private employers for hiring teachers during the summer; the Fund for Innovation, which assisted school boards and teachers in implementing agreements on decision making, problem resolution, and new organizational

structures; and the Empire State Challenge Scholarship and Fellowship programs for students preparing to teach in shortage areas.

Another program was not funded by the legislature due to the severe economic conditions in the state. The Mentor Teacher-Internship program, which was due to be fully implemented in 1993, again received no funding. While many districts will continue this program with local funds and with help from business and industry, the State Board of Education will again seek state funds from the 1994 legislature to implement this program statewide.

The state education board's initiative, A New Compact for Learning, involves school improvement, restructuring, and new roles for teachers. As a part of this effort, local school boards were required to develop and adopt a plan by February 1, 1994 for the participation of teachers and parents with administrators and school board members in school-based planning and shared decision-making. The plan, developed in cooperation with the local superintendent, administrators, teachers, and parents, is to specify:

The issues which will be subject to cooperative planning and shared decision-making at the building level by teachers, parents, administrators, and other parties such as students, support staff, and community members as authorized by the board;

The manner and extent of the expected involvement of all parties;

The standards by which improvement will be measured;

The means by which all parties will be held accountable;

The process for settling disputes; and

The manner in which state and federal requirements for the involvement of parents in planning and decision-making will be met by the plan.

In Rochester, the Career in Teaching (CIT) program continues. A 1988 career options agreement between the Rochester City School District and the Rochester Teachers' Association enables teachers to remain in the classroom and to assume different duties for part of the day. The contract also increased salaries, added days to the school year for teachers, moved away from a pay scale based solely on years of experience and degrees, and included school-based planning committees. The CIT program involves four career levels and incorporates the district's Peer Assistance and Review program (first implemented in 1986) that provides internships for new teachers and intervention to tenured teachers who need assistance. It is overseen by a joint panel of 12 members—six appointed by the teachers' organization and six by the superintendent.

The career levels are intern, resident, professional, and lead teacher. Teachers who successfully complete their internship become residents until they are fully certified and tenured. Tenured, certified teachers are designated as "professionals"; this designation is a prerequisite for the lead teacher level. Lead teachers not only serve as mentors but also work as demonstration teachers, coordinators for staff development, heads of special projects, integrated curriculum designers, and adjunct instructors in teacher education. They are selected through a competitive process by the joint panel and must have seven years of teaching experience, five of which must be in Rochester. All lead teachers must have direct contact with students.

A newly adopted contract between the school district and the teachers' association expands on the previous agreement. Under the new contract, group accountability provisions recognize that schools or groups of educators within schools are the essential unit of accountability. A $1 million fund has been set aside for incentive awards which will be linked to student progress on agreed-upon achievement measures and other indicators of quality. The teacher members of the school-based planning teams in the schools receiving awards will administer the funds which can be used to promote effective practices.

North Carolina

Since at least 1946, the General Assembly of North Carolina has attempted to develop a fair and acceptable method for differentiating teachers' salaries based on merit or success. Although several efforts at experimental programs have been made, none proved acceptable to the majority of teachers. In 1989 the Assembly passed the School Improvement and Accountability Act as part of a move to decentralize power and decision-making authority. This legislation granted local school districts the right to create school improvement plans, which had to set measurable student performance goals. These plans could include requests for waivers from certain state laws and pay plans as specific strategies for improving student performance. Although participation was optional, every district in the state submitted a school improvement plan, and every plan included differentiated pay.

The legislation called for funding for differentiated pay to increase annually from 2 percent of certified staff salaries in 1991, to 3, 4, 5, and 7 percent in subsequent years. Fiscal constraints, however, made it impossible to support the projected funding increases. Only the first year of implementation was funded at the planned level of 2 percent. In 1991, projected increases in the teacher's salary schedule were canceled, and the General Assembly allowed each district's certified staff to vote whether to continue the local pay plan or to distribute funds originally allocated for differentiated bonuses as an across-the-board pay increase in 1991-92. Funding remained at 2 percent of staff salaries. Of 133 districts, 100 voted for across-the-board increases.

In 1992, the General Assembly revitalized efforts to implement local differentiated pay plans. In HB 1340, which amended the School Improvement Accountability Act, the Assembly granted schools an even greater role in planning. Each district's board of education, in consultation with a broad-based advisory committee, is responsible for adopting education goals. At each school, committees of staff and parents representing that school will then develop building level plans, including requests for legal waivers and plans for differentiated pay. These, in turn, will be submitted for approval to the local board. The board must accept school plans as written or return them to the school with specific reasons for rejection. The school may then submit a revised plan to the board. The board may develop a plan for any school that has not submitted an acceptable plan by March 15 of that year. A total of 1.5 to 2 percent of certified salary budgets will be allocated to support the new pay plans in 1992-93.

In 1993, the General Assembly continued funding for differentiated pay at the current level. In addition to some new performance indicators, requirements for a systemwide staff development plan and fiscal disclosures of expenditures of differentiated pay monies by the principal to his or her respective school staff were included. All staff members of the central offices and schools were made eligible for participation in the funding of differentiated pay as determined by local plans.

In conclusion, funding for the School Improvement and Accountability Act of 1989 remains at 2 percent of certified staff salaries. However, in spite of fiscal constraints, the North Carolina General Assembly has continued funding each year since implementation in 1990-91. Revisions to the original legislation provide increased opportunities for site-based decision making and continue to focus on student outcomes.

North Dakota

In 1986, a state model for in-service education and staff development was adopted in North Dakota. The model is designed to guide local districts in meeting the professional growth needs of teachers. However, no state funding has been available to address the needs of veteran teachers.

Ohio

The Master Plan for Excellence, adopted in 1984 by the State Board of Education, called for the creation of a career ladder and peer review program. In a feasibility study completed in 1987, the State Department of Education and Miami University suggested that districts should develop local incentive programs with state assistance and using state-adopted guidelines. For the 1992-1993 biennium, over $2.1 million was appropriated to continue ongoing pilot projects in the state.

For the 1994-95 biennium, the state legislature has appropriated $2.2 million to be used by the State Department of Education to fund existing career enhancement programs that have effectively used grants in prior years to promote the use of peer review strategies for improving instructional performance and to promote the use of career ladders. Funding within this program will be allocated to the qualifying districts based upon a review process conducted by the Department. The Legislative Office of Education Oversight is evaluating the use of peer review and career ladder programs in improving instructional performance. The results of this evaluation will determine to what extent additional state funds will be allocated in future fiscal years.

Two of the districts that have had ongoing pilot programs are Toledo and Cincinnati. The Toledo project involves a career ladder with five levels after the initial qualification stage. Initial qualification is based on five areas—letters of reference, written essay, an interview before a three-member committee, a lesson portfolio, and six classroom observations by three mentor teachers. Movement up the ladder requires classroom observation and additional assignments. Teachers may opt to remain at the third level of the ladder, which requires periodic observation and the completion of one special project annually to hold that position. Requirements for the top two levels include a master's degree or graduate hours in an academic area.

The Cincinnati school district implemented a four-step career ladder plan, the Career in Teaching Program. Teachers on the top two steps of the ladder receive stipends. Teachers on the third level of the ladder, known as career teachers, are receiving stipends of $1,000 in 1993-94. On the top level of the ladder, teachers with 10 years of experience (the last five in Cincinnati) are eligible to become lead teachers and receive stipends ranging from $1,000 to $5,500, depending on the additional duties they assume. Selection is based on written applications and performance evaluations and on interviews conducted by "trained teacher observers."

In 1990, the State Department of Education released the Plan for Phasing In Career Ladder Programs, which serves as a guide to districts designing locally financed career ladder programs. Districts developing programs must address each of the 14 areas contained in the plan. These areas include goals and objectives for the career ladder program, eligibility requirements, selection process, criteria for placement and advancement, professional development, financial rewards, and program evaluation and revision. A number of districts are using the state plan to develop local programs; however, there are no plans at this time to seek funds for statewide implementation.

Oklahoma

As part of a comprehensive educational reform bill passed by the Oklahoma legislature in 1990, local boards of education in Oklahoma were called upon to adopt academically based district incentive pay plans beginning with the 1991-92 school year. The local boards may adopt their own plan or choose one of five model plans developed by the State Board of Education. Plans may not permit more than a 20 percent increase in a teacher's salary for one year. A local board must also appoint an advisory committee consisting of teachers, parents, and local citizens to advise the board in formulating an incentive pay plan.

Beginning with the 1991-92 school year, a school district was required to adopt and implement an incentive pay plan when the local board of education receives a petition signed by 20 percent of the district classroom teachers calling for the adoption of an incentive pay plan. Local districts are also required to provide for a local evaluation committee to advise the board on which teachers are to receive incentive pay awards and the amount of each award. State funds were not provided for the program in 1993-94.

In the Oklahoma City Public Schools, Project Phoenix is underway to improve education in seven schools that have been cited as academically troubled. (A statewide program identifies schools in which student achievement is below desired levels.) Teachers who accept positions in the schools receive a $300 bonus. An additional $400 is received if the school improves achievement and is no longer an "academically troubled" school. Other bonuses are available for improving student achievement and attendance in special academic programs. The district also developed a performance-based pay package for central office and building administrators. Staff are eligible for bonuses based on improved composite or reading test scores. Principals and assistant principals may earn more than $8,000 through incentives based on student progress, teacher attendance, and schools being removed from the state list of academically troubled schools. All schools have now been taken off the "high challenge" list.

Legislation passed in 1991 created an alternative certification program for teachers and also called for a Task Force on Teacher Preparation. The task force presented recommendations in December of 1991 on preparation and licensure of teachers that were ultimately passed as legislation in 1992. The recommendations to be implemented called for moving to a new teacher licensing system as well as recognizing and rewarding teachers who have achieved National Board certification. The legislation called for a teacher preparation system that included excellence in arts and sciences, in-depth knowledge of subject matter, an understanding of child development, and how to interact effectively with a diverse student population. Preservice preparation is to be completed within a four-year degree program. The in-service programs will include a three-year entry level plan and continuing education throughout a teacher's career.

Oregon

The 1987 Oregon legislature passed a bill providing for a professional development and school improvement program designed to address four areas: 1) the development of educational goals for individual schools and districts; 2) the assessment of educational progress of school programs and students; 3) the professional growth and career opportunities for Oregon teachers; and 4) the restructuring of the school workplace to provide teachers with the responsibilities and authority commensurate with their status as professionals. For the 1987-89 biennium, $2.4 million was appropriated to support pilot projects developed by local committees at 70 schools across the state. Funds were allocated to provide $1,000 per teacher at each pilot site. For 1989-91, the legislature appropriated $4.6 million to continue this project and add additional sites; the pilot sites expanded to a total of 86 schools. The same level of funding in the 1991-93 biennium provided up to $1,000 per teacher at 114 sites.

Within the same legislation, the Beginning Teacher Support Program was established to ensure that the induction of beginning teachers is conducive to professional growth and development. As outlined in the law, each district that qualified to participate in the program would receive $3,000 to support each beginning teacher. Biennial funding was provided at a level of $3.9 million: 650 beginning teachers and their mentors participated in the program each year of the biennium. Due in part to economic pressures and to a low turnover rate among experienced teachers, funding was reduced to $3 million for the 1991-93 biennium.

Both the professional development/school improvement effort and the Beginning Teacher Support program were replaced by a school restructuring law passed in 1991. The Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century declares all students can learn and a restructured educational system is necessary to achieve the state's goals. The Department of Education received $2 million in the 1991-93 biennium to formulate guidelines and implementation strategies. Financial support for development and implementation continues in the 1993-95 biennium. Additionally, $7 million is available for restructuring grants tied directly to the reform legislation which stresses student performance and site-based decision-making. All schools are to have school councils composed of teachers, administrators, parents, and other school employees in place by September 1995.

Oregon has also adopted the 21st Century School Program to make fundamental changes to school operations and to formal relationships among teachers, administrators, and local citizens. According to the 1989 law, schools or districts submit plans to the State Department of Education that include proposed changes, for example, to curriculum requirements; graduation requirements; and the certification, assignment, and formal responsibilities of teachers, administrators, and other school personnel. The student learning and educational outcomes expected and a description of the statutes and rules to be waived to complete the plan also must be included. Required annual reports showing changes in student learning and other performance indicators are submitted to a state advisory committee and to the community.

Pennsylvania

The Pennsylvania State Department of Education awarded $4 million in grants to districts in 1984-85 for local efforts to improve instruction through training, to sponsor new programs developed by teachers, and to provide incentives for teachers. Nearly all of the state's 500 districts participated in the initial program, which received the same appropriation for 1985-86.

For 1986-87, the state legislature increased the funding to $7 million; 67 of the districts developed incentive programs.

In 1987-88, the scope of the program was modified and $4 million was appropriated for districts to promote effective teaching. Districts could use the funds to support programs for mentor teachers and continuing professional development. No funds were provided for incentive pay.

Legislation passed in 1988 created the School Performance Incentives Program. This program granted awards to schools demonstrating sufficient improvement in any of three areas: improved student achievement as indicated in statewide testing, reduction of dropout rates, and preparation for higher education as indicated by simultaneous rises in the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) participation rate and scores. Funds were allocated among the recipient schools in proportion to their numbers of full-time-equivalent teachers. Subject to the district school board's approval, the staff of the recipient school decided how to use the award to further improve education within that school, though no funds could be used for salary increases or bonuses to current employees. Early in 1989, this program distributed $5 million to 209 schools; in 1990, an identical sum went to 235 schools. In 1991, $4 million went to 560 schools. The $2 million available in 1991-92 was awarded to 380 schools. Although the program still exists in law, funding has been discontinued.

In both 1990-91 and 1991-92, $1.5 million was appropriated for the continuing professional development of teachers. These funds supported nine regional lead teacher centers. More than 10,000 leaders have been trained thus far. In 1993-94, $1.4 million in funding is again available and the Department of Education is requesting $2 million for 1995.

Districts are required by law to implement school-based induction and professional development programs as a part of the state's certification requirements. Guidelines for these programs are provided by the State Department of Education and districts submit their plans to the Department for approval as a part of their six-year strategic plan. Funds are not earmarked specifically for these programs; districts use formula funds to carry out the state mandate.

Rhode Island

Staff in the Office of Teacher Education and Certification are working with the Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and the Islands, New England states, and New York in the development of *Mentoring: A Resource and Training Guide for Educators* At least one site in each of the participating states has been identified to pilot the activities in the draft guidebook. Teams of educators from each site participated in three two-day regional training sessions throughout 1992-93.

The pilot site in Rhode Island has been identified as a collaborative between the Pawtucket School District, Providence College, and the Department of Education. Experienced teachers took part in a training program, and all beginning special education teachers will be assigned a mentor teacher who will provide assistance and support during 1993-94.

South Carolina

During South Carolina's 1991 legislative session, a *Campus Incentive Program* was established to reward faculty members of schools that demonstrate superior performance and

productivity. Principals, assistant principals, all teachers, library media specialists, guidance counselors, psychologists, school nurses, and others, as determined by an advisory committee, are eligible to participate in the program. Funding of $17 million was allocated, with $10.5 million of the funds to be spent to reward teachers and $3.46 million for principals and other faculty. The remaining $3.1 million "may be used by school districts and any school to compensate faculty for their time and effort in the area of school improvement and planning, and such activities as research, curriculum development, coordination of courses and special projects, or other activities the faculty may wish to undertake for improving student performance, development, and learning and coordination of services with other social and health agencies."

A 20-member Campus Incentive Advisory Committee was appointed by the State Board of Education, the state superintendent, and the governor. The Campus Incentive Committee recommended that awards be based on several indicators and that schools must demonstrate exceptional improvement or maintain superior student performance to receive awards. Persons receiving awards will be full-time employees; an unsatisfactory evaluation disqualifies a faculty member from receiving the awards. Administrative costs for the program are not to exceed $250,000, and districts receive $1 per student to cover administrative costs. Indicators include student learning outcomes, parent participation, restructuring efforts, staff development/ continued professional growth, school climate, early intervention (for elementary and middle schools), and school dropout rates for high schools.

The Campus Incentive Program replaced two programs that were developed as a result of the Education Improvement Act of 1984. The Teacher Incentive Program (funded at $21.5 million in 1990-91) and the Principal Incentive Program (funded at $1.5 million) paid teachers and principals who earned awards in 1990, but have been discontinued. The Teacher Incentive Program rewarded teachers under a bonus plan, and a campus/individual model. Criteria were based on superior performance and attendance, performance evaluation, student achievement, and self improvement. The Principal Incentive Program had rewarded principals who demonstrated superior performance and productivity.

The 1993 legislative session provided for a one-time bonus to classroom teachers. The State Department of Education was directed to distribute $11,500,000 of the Campus Incentive Program funds to pay for the bonus. The State Department projects that the average bonus will be approximately $266.

The School Incentive Reward Program was created by the 1984 Education Improvement Act and is now beginning its tenth year. Legislation in 1989 made School Incentive Program awards (in two of three years) the primary criterion for granting flexibility to schools through deregulation. Approximately 30 percent of the 1,016 schools in the state received $5 million in rewards during 1992-93. Rewards are based on schools meeting criteria that include student achievement gain, student and teacher attendance, and dropout rates at Grades 7-8 and 9-12. The achievement gain criterion must be met for a school to receive a reward; attendance and dropout rates qualify reward winners for additional funds.

Schools meeting all criteria received $26 per pupil to be used for expenses related to instruction; funds cannot be used for staff salaries. Schools also received flags and certificates signifying their reward status. An additional 176 schools were awarded honorable mention status for showing improvement in achievement and received $1,000 each.

Individual student scores are tracked from one year to the next to determine progress. The student results are aggregated at the school level, and the top quarter of schools are rewarded

in each of five comparison groups. The comparison groups are based on student backgrounds and school resources. A second method of qualifying for incentive grants was introduced in the 1992-93 year. Based on the same student and school characteristics, an expected student achievement gain was determined for schools. Schools which exceeded their expected gain by the largest degree were selected as reward recipients. Districts in which two-thirds of the schools were incentive winners receive an additional $2 per student. Vocational centers are eligible for rewards if their sending schools meet the student achievement criterion and the vocational center achieves three-year student placement rates of 50 percent or greater for 90 percent or more of their vocational programs. Five school districts and 27 centers received rewards in 1992-93.

The most recent survey of attitudes toward the program, conducted during the 1987-88 school year, found that most respondents regarded the program favorably; 90 percent of principals and teachers supported the concept of rewarding schools for achievement gains and 85 percent believed that goal-setting and hard work won awards.

As testing on a statewide basis declines, a new set of criteria to qualify for incentive grants is being developed. Longtitudinal analyses will be replaced by other analyses which continue to focus on student achievement gains.

South Dakota

In 1985, the South Dakota legislature enacted a career ladder for teachers and administrators, but implementation of the plan was blocked by a petition drive which, although not aimed at the career ladder, effectively thwarted the legislation of which it was a part. Originally, a three-level career ladder certification system would have been created. Provisions relating to only the first level in the original ladder have been retained.

Legislation passed in 1986 created a statewide induction program for first-year teachers and administrators. Under this program, first-year certificates were issued to new teachers and administrators. During the first year, each was assisted and evaluated by a team representing the local school district, higher education, and the South Dakota Department of Education. At the end of the year, the team either recommended full certification or another year in the induction program. For 1988-89, $300,000 in state funds were appropriated for this program. The legislation has been repealed; however, districts may continue or initiate mentor programs with local funding.

South Dakota's teacher educator program, an incentive program for career teachers designed to improve the supervision of student teachers and to provide assistance to first- year teachers is in its third year of operation in 1993-94. State Department of Education officials continue to work with teachers who have completed the 3-credit semester course required for teacher educator endorsement in preparation for serving student teachers in the cooperating teacher role. In addition, funds will again be provided for experienced teachers serving as mentors to first-year teachers.

Requirements for the teacher educator endorsement include three years of successful teaching experience and recommendations from a university and local school administrator as well as the 3-credit semester course. State officials, universities, and other education agencies will continue to lobby for additional funding to expand the program.

Tennessee

Tennessee's Career Ladder Program is in its ninth year of implementation statewide. The program includes a three-rung ladder for teachers (general education and vocational education), special populations educators (special education teachers and speech/language specialists), library media specialists, special groups educators (school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, attendance supervisors, and consulting teachers), instructional supervisors, and assistant principals and principals.

Significant revisions in the Career Ladder evaluation system were implemented during the 1991-92 year. The goals of the revisions were as follows:

1) An emphasis on the improvement of instruction through increased feedback;

2) A scoring process more understandable to the candidate; and

3) Reduction in the length of time for the evaluation process and availability of results.

As a part of the ongoing process of program evaluation, questionnaires were mailed to all candidates and administrators who participated in the process during the 1991-92 school year. The questionnaires were administered after the educators had completed the evaluation process and had been informed of their final Career Ladder score. Candidates and administrators responded positively to the revisions and provided constructive feedback for additional refinements. All evaluation systems are thoroughly evaluated each year through this same process.

Salary supplements range from $1,000 to $7,000, according to the Career Ladder level and the length of contract. Presently, 43,340 educators are on the ladder, with 9,054 educators at the upper levels. Approximately 95 percent of all those eligible (educators must hold a professional license, have appropriate experience, and be in a Career Ladder position) are on the first level; 28 percent of those eligible are on Career Levels II and III. Around 1,200 educators have applied for evaluation for upper level evaluations during 1994-95.

Educators may voluntarily seek Career Levels I, II, or III, based on evaluation of performance in the classroom or workplace and years of experience. Career Level I is determined by local district evaluation. Career Levels II and III may be determined by a three-member state evaluation team or an evaluation team composed of the educator's superordinate and two state evaluators. The educator may choose either evaluation model, but the superordinate and the educator must both agree to the latter "combination" model. The "combination" model is available only to general education, special populations, library media specialists, and special groups educators.

Since 1989, educators who are not on the upper levels of the Career Ladder have been allowed to participate in the extended contract program. This program provides extra money to educators for additional work, primarily during the summer. A school district's extended contract program is based on an assessment of student needs and may include adult literacy and extended school child care activities.

Legislation passed in 1992 put forth a comprehensive reform package for Tennessee's schools. Included in the effort is a system that requires every district to have performance goals. A system is to be developed for determining educational outcomes and progress in student learning that reveals the effect of the educator, school, or school district on students' educational progress. This "value added assessment" will eventually be reported by class,

schools, and local school systems. Funding above and beyond the Basic Education Program is to be used to reward schools that exceed the performance standards set by the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education. Funding will not be available before the 1994-95 school year.

Texas

The 1992-93 school year marked the ninth year of the Texas Teacher Career Ladder. An estimated $288 million was appropriated for school year 1992-93. Legislation passed in 1993 abolished the Career Ladder Program. Teachers who received stipends in 1992-93 are to continue to receive the stipends in 1993-94 and each year thereafter.

At the request of the Commissioner of Education, the legislature had authorized the development of a new initiative with primary focus on helping Texas schools to improve student learning outcomes for all students and to close the performance gap that exists among various student populations. This new effort, identified as the Partnership Schools Initiative, will cut across existing programs, delivery systems, and barriers or constraints and enable the state and participating districts to concentrate on:

1) The student;

2) The real world outcomes necessary for that student; and

3) The program or programs necessary for that student to reach the identified, desired outcomes.

Legislation passed during the July 1991 special session called for the Governor's Educational Excellence Committee Awards Program to be replaced by a new program—Texas Successful Schools. The program "recognizes or rewards those schools and school districts that demonstrate progress or success in achieving the educational goals of the state." The program is funded according to a set amount for each student ($30 million has been appropriated for the biennium). Four types of awards are given, with the two performance gain awards tied to money for a school. Major non-monetary and monetary awards are given for high performance (excellence) and performance gain. Two additional types of non-monetary and monetary recognition are outstanding performance effort and effort for performance gain.

In the summer of 1993, $20 million was awarded to 507 schools that met criteria for performance gains on student achievement, reducing dropout rates for middle and high school students, and college admissions test (SAT and/or ACT) score data. Top awards ranged from $30,000 to $150,000 and effort awards ranged from $10,000 to $25,000 depending on enrollment. Performance outcome criteria for groups of students within a school are used along with the performance of all students. Almost 800 schools received non-monetary awards based on meeting or exceeding State Board of Education standards or criteria for outstanding performance efforts. School site councils decide how the money is to be spent to improve academic performance at the school. Money may be used for personnel or services. The legislation prohibits the awards to be spent on athletics.

Utah

Utah's Career Ladder program, now in its ninth year, is funded at $38 million in 1993-94. Allocations to the state's 40 school districts are based on the weighted pupil units and the

number of certificated educators employed by each district. District designed plans are developed following 1984 guidelines established by the legislature. Additionally, Utah's five Applied Technology Centers and the Utah Schools for the Deaf and Blind receive line item allocations for their career ladder programs.

The Career Ladder Program has six major parts: performance bonus, job enlargement, extended contract days, teacher in-service, teacher shortage, and the career ladder. Performance bonus recognizes and rewards excellence in the classroom. Job enlargement provides extra pay for extra work. Extended contract days provide for paid non-teaching days beyond the regular school year. Teachers are placed on the career ladder based on their experience and expertise. Previously, 50 percent of the total funding was required to be spent on the ladder, job enlargement, and performance bonus. Legislation in 1991 removed the percentage requirement and added a provision that will allow for teams of teachers to receive performance bonuses. In 1992, legislation added the in-service component.

In 1991, 11 school districts received career ladder funding in a "block grant" allocation, which freed them from the normal program requirements and reporting. Evaluations conducted in 1991 on the block grant part of the Career Ladder Program found change in the program resulting from block grant status was evident in only a few of the districts. All of the districts reported "enjoying the flexibility of moving funds" (even through most had never used it) and. . . believed "the block grant had led to improvements in the districts (e.g., increased teacher commitment and buy-in; more site-based management)." The evaluators, however, were unable to confirm that these perceptions were directly related to block grant funding and not just coincidental. While legislation in 1992 removed "block grant" status, districts and Applied Technology Centers can request a waiver for a one-year continuation of an existing career ladder plan.

Vermont

As part of certification regulations adopted by the Vermont State Board of Education several years ago, a 23-member Standards Board for Professional Educators was created. A majority of the board members are teachers; the others are administrators, school board members, representatives of higher education, and the public. The board is not considering any career ladder concept or performance-based incentive program at this time; however, it has established local and regional standards boards in the state to recommend license renewals for practicing teachers and administrators.

The State Standards Board also wrote, with local input, a document that will describe the standards of model professional development experiences. The local and regional standards boards (for which a majority of members are selected by educators) will approve each educator's individual Professional Development Plan and determine the appropriateness of teacher learning activities to meet individual, school, and district goals. When a license is due to expire, local and regional boards will review a completed teacher portfolio based upon that plan and make recommendations for renewal.

Virginia

Funds were appropriated in the 1991 session of the General Assembly to develop mentor teacher programs as a transition from the required Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP) in which beginning teachers were evaluated and received assistance. Because funds for

the transitional program were limited and the Department of Education wanted school divisions to feel a strong sense of ownership toward any program developed, the approach was to require competitive proposals for grant awards. Forty-one local school divisions received grants of $10,000 to develop mentor teacher programs for the needs of beginning teachers. The project also provided a training institute for teachers, statewide teleconferences on developing programs, and project assistance to divisions. A video tape and resource notebook were developed for use by districts.

A program to provide grants to schools for school improvement is underway. Plans must include establishment of priorities, identification of training needs and expected improvement in student achievement. Schools must show community involvement and school board support for a plan. Local resources to support the plan and staff development are required. Grants for start-up provide $2,500. Schools in partnership may receive funding of $2,500 to $30,000.

Washington

The Teacher Assistance Program in Washington, now in its ninth year, is operating with an appropriation of $3.3 million for the 1993-95 biennium. Currently, 800 teams of one mentor and one teacher or other educational personnel are being supported. Of the $3.3 million appropriation, $400,000 is earmarked for special pilot projects that match full-time mentors with beginning teachers and experienced teachers who are having difficulty.

A program initiated six years ago, Schools for the 21st Century, provides grants to selected schools and districts for developing innovative programs. The legislature appropriated $3.9 million for the first year of the 1993-95 biennium, so funding will end in June 1994. Thirty-three projects in the state are now supported by 21st Century grants. The proposals for the grants were developed at the school level with parent, teacher, and administrative input. The grants are used, for example, to purchase equipment and supplies, provide in-service training for instructional staff, and pay staff for working additional days. It should be noted that all of the proposals added 10 days to the teachers' school year for staff planning and curriculum development.

West Virginia

Comprehensive legislation enacted in West Virginia during 1990 included several programs for teachers. Currently, a beginning teacher internship program exists and guidelines have been developed. Support teams for beginning teachers include a principal, a county staff development council member, and an experienced classroom teacher. A requirement calls for the mentor teacher and the beginning teacher to have joint planning periods during the day. Mentor teachers have been trained and receive $600 in additional compensation.

The law also called for a uniform, statewide system of evaluation, with development of a common evaluation instrument and training for evaluators. The legislation also established the Center for Professional Development and provided $2 million in funds. The Center trains teachers in developmental instruction, focusing on grades 1 through 12, and provides training on evaluation skills for administrators and principals. During the summer of 1993, the Center for Professional Development held eight summer institutes for "Teachers as Managers of Change." These institutes trained teachers of grades 5 through 8. During the summer and fall of 1993, Administrators' Evaluation Institutes were designed to train all new administrators in evaluation skills and strategies.

In addition, every school has a local school improvement council that includes the principal, teachers, parents, and other citizens. The councils may develop alternatives for the school, such as applying for waivers of policies and rules. Each school has a faculty senate with authority to develop school-based management procedures or policy. Decisions might include employment of new teachers, recognition of outstanding teachers, and development of the master schedule. Each faculty senate decides how $150 of the $200 allotted to teachers for instructional materials will be spent. Also, every school must establish a curriculum team consisting of three teachers, the principal, and the counselor designated to serve that school. The curriculum team must develop the curriculum and methods for its implementation at the school.

Wisconsin

In 1985-86, the Wisconsin State Department of Education issued guidelines and standards to be used in the development of local district proposals for teacher incentive pilot programs. Funding of $1 million was provided for the initial two-year period (1985-87). Eight proposals, involving 35 to 40 local districts, were initially funded. The pilots continued in 1987-88 with a one-year extension of funding at a level of $214,000. No further funding has been provided. A follow-up report on the pilot projects offered two conclusions:

- Beginning teacher assistance programs work when they are planned, funded, and coordinated by the state. It is both appropriate and within the means of the state to ensure that beginning teachers are well prepared and supported during their first year.
- Career ladder programs and teacher recognition awards do not benefit from state direction. The long-term career needs and resources of teachers in individual districts are so distinct from each other that these two kinds of programs should be developed when there is sufficient local interest and resolve to implement them effectively.

The State Department of Education has been unsuccessful in securing funds to implement a statewide beginning teacher assistance program.

Wyoming

Although discussion continues relative to the consideration of merit in teacher compensation, no statewide action has been taken in Wyoming. Local districts have the flexibility to initiate teacher improvement programs from local funding.

State information compiled by Gale F. Gaines, Associate Director, and Lynn M. Cornett, Vice President for State Services, SREB.

1992 State Contacts

Alabama—Mary N. Hogan, Coordinator of Leadership and Management, Alabama Department of Education, 50 North Ripley Street, Montgomery, AL 36130 (205) 242-9833

Alaska—Sandra Berry, Chapter II Coordinator, Alaska Department of Education, 801 West 10th, Suite 200, Juneau, AK 99811-1894 (907) 465-8723

Arizona—Linda Fuller, Career Ladder Program Director, Arizona Department of Education, 1535 West Jefferson, Phoenix, AZ 85007 (602) 542-5837

Arkansas—Betty Gale Davis, Coordinator, Staff Development, Arkansas Department of Education, #4 Capitol Mall, 402-B, Little Rock, AR 72201 (501) 682-4247

California—Sue Garmston, Consultant, Office of Teaching Support, Department of Education, P.O. Box 944272, Room 639, Sacramento, CA 94244-2420 (916) 657-5482

Colorado—Carol Ruckel, Senior Consultant, Colorado Department of Education, 201 East Colfax Avenue, Denver, CO 80203 (303) 866-6848

Connecticut—Richard Vaillancourt, Consultant, State Department of Education, P.O. Box 2219, Hartford, CT 06145-2219 (203) 566-5750

Delaware—Patricia Bent, Education Associate, Department of Public Instruction, P.O. Box 1402, Dover, DE 19903 (302) 739-2771

Florida—Larry D. Hutcheson, Chief, Bureau of Program Support Services, Room 714, (904) 488-5270; Thomas Fisher, Administrator, Assessment, Testing, and Evaluation Section, and Janice P. Smith-Dann, Program Specialist, Room 701, (904) 488-8198; Florida Education Center, Florida Department of Education, 325 West Gaines Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399

Georgia—Jess Elliott, Director, Pay for Performance Program, Division of Research, Evaluation and Assessment, Georgia Department of Education, 1868 Twin Towers East, Atlanta, GA 30334 (404) 656-2661

Hawaii—Lilliann Noda, Personnel Specialist, State Department of Education, P.O. Box 2360, Honolulu, HI 96813 (808) 586-3204

Idaho—James A. Smith, Supervisor, Teacher Education and Certification, State Department of Education, Len B. Jordan Office Building, 650 West State Street, Boise, ID 83720 (208) 334-4713

Illinois—Susan K. Bentz, Assistant Superintendent, Illinois State Board of Education, 100 North First Street, Springfield, IL 62704 (217) 782-3774

Indiana—George Stuckey, Director of Staff Performance Evaluation, State Department of Education, Room 229, State House, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798 (317) 232-9044

Iowa—Edith Eckles, Consultant, State Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146 (515) 281-5332

Kansas—Dale M. Dennis, Deputy Commissioner of Education, Kansas State Board of Education, 120 East Tenth Avenue, Topeka, KS 66612-1182 (913) 296-3871

Kentucky—Sandy Gubser, Director, Division of Management Assistance, Kentucky Department of Education, 6th Floor Capital Plaza Tower, 500 Mero Street, Frankfort, KY 40601 (502) 564-2116

Louisiana—Susan Johnson, Education Section Administrator (504) 342-3366; Marie Weiss, Assistant Administrator, Bureau of Professional Accountability (504) 342-1146; Louisiana Department of Education, P.O. Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064

Maine—Nancy T. Ibarguen, Director, Certification and Placement, State House Station #23, Augusta, ME 04333 (207) 287-5944

Maryland—Rochelle L. Clemson, Chief, Teacher Education and Certification Branch, Maryland State Department of Education, 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, MD 21201-2595 (301) 333-2155

Massachusetts—Julie Altshuler, Director, Bureau Teacher Preparation and Program Approval, Massachusetts Department of Education, 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5023 (617) 338-3300

Michigan—Sara Ann Lincoln, Education Consultant, School Improvement/Professional Development Office, State Department of Education, P.O. Box 30008, Lansing, MI 48909 (517) 373-3608

Minnesota—Judith A. Wain, Executive Secretary, Minnesota Board of Teaching, 608 Capitol Square Building (612) 296-2415; and Judy McGilvrey, Teacher Education Specialist, 609 Capital Square Building (612) 296-9738; 550 Cedar Street, St. Paul, MN 55101

Mississippi—Ginger Steadman, Director, Health Related Services, Mississippi Department of Education, P.O. Box 771, Jackson, MS 39205 (601) 359-2459

Missouri—Janet Goeller, Supervisor, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, State Department of Education, P.O. Box 480, Jefferson City, MO 65102 (314) 751-1191

Montana—Wayne G. Buchanan, Executive Secretary, Board of Public Education; Peter Donovan, Administrative Officer, Certification Standards & Practices Advisory Council; 2500 Broadway, Helena, MT 59620 (406) 444-6576

Nebraska—Marge Harouff, Assistant Commissioner, Division of Education Services, State Department of Education, 301 Centennial Mall South, P.O. Box 94987, Lincoln, NE 68509-4987 (402) 471-4800

Nevada—Mary L. Peterson, Deputy Superintendent, Instructional, Research and Evaluative Services (702) 687-3104; Doris B. Betts, Education Consultant, Federal and Related Programs (702) 687-3187; State Department of Education, 400 West King Street, Carson City, NV 89710

New Hampshire—Joanne Baker, Administrator, Professional Standards Development Unit, State Department of Education, 101 Pleasant Street, Concord, NH 03301 (603) 271-2632

New Jersey—Susan E. Sliker, Program Administrator, Division of Urban Education and Field Services, New Jersey State Department of Education, 225 East State Street, CN 500, Trenton, NJ 08625-0500 (609) 292-1544

New Mexico—Michael A. Kaplan, Assistant Director, School Program & Professional Development Unit, New Mexico Department of Education, 300 Don Gaspar, Santa Fe, NM 87501-2786 (505) 827-6576

New York—Charles C. Mackey, Jr., Administrator, Teacher Certification Policy, Office of Teaching, New York State Education Department, Room 5A-11, Cultural Education Center, Albany, NY 12230 (518) 474-6440

North Carolina—Doug Mabe, Consultant, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, Education Building, 301 North Wilmington Street, Raleigh, NC 27601-2825 (919) 715-1065

North Dakota—Ordean M. Lindemann, Director of Teacher Certification, North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, 600 East Boulevard, Bismarck, ND 58505 (701) 224-2264

Ohio—Nancy Ann Eberhart, Director; Gregg Stubbs, Grants Administrator; Division of Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Development, State Department of Education, 65 South Front Street, Room 611, Columbus, Ohio 43266-0308 (614) 752-9573

Oklahoma—Ramona Paul, Assistant State Superintendent, Professional Services Division, Oklahoma State Department of Education, 2500 N. Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, OK 73105-4599 (405) 521-4311

Oregon—Rex Crouse, Specialist, 21st Century Schools Council, Oregon Department of Education, Public Service Buidling, 255 Capitol NE, Salem, OR 97310-0203 (503) 378-8004

Pennsylvania—Joseph Skok, Chief, Division of School Based Improvement, Pennsylvania Department of Education, 333 Market Street, Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333 (717) 783-1830

Rhode Island—Louis E. Del Papa, Director of Teacher Education and Certification, Rhode Island Department of Education, 22 Hayes Street, Providence, RI 02908 (401) 277-6887

South Carolina—Valerie Truesdale, Senior Executive Assistant, State Department of Education, 606 Rutledge Building 1429 Senate Street, Columbia, SC 29201 (803) 734-8258

South Dakota—LeRoy B. Fugitt, Director, Office of Educational Accountability, Department of Education and Cultural Affairs, 700 Governors Drive, Pierre, SD 57501 (605) 773-4770

Tennessee—Carlette Humbard, Systems Development/Evaluator Training (615) 532-4768; Donnie Jordan, Director of Career Ladder (615) 532-4719; State Department of Education, Division of Accountability, 5th Floor, Gateway Plaza, 710 James Robertson Parkway, Nashville, TN 37243-0376

Texas—Linda Hargrove, Educational Program Director; Nancy Stevens, Director of Programs; Office of Policy Planning and Evaluation, Texas Education Agency, 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, TX 78701 (512) 463-9701

Utah—Linda H. Alder, Curriculum Coordinator, Instructional Services Division, Utah State Office of Education, 250 East 500 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84111 (801) 538-7884

Vermont—Richard T. Dillon, Chief, Licensing and Professional Standards Unit, State Department of Education, 120 State Street, Montpelier, VT 05602 (802) 828-2444

Virginia—James C. Chancey, Jr., Lead, Teacher Education (804) 225-2737; Larry W. Brooks, Coordinator, Center for Staff Development (804) 225-2026; Virginia Department of Education, P.O. Box 2120, Richmond, VA 23216-2120

Washington—Joanne Sorenson, Certification Specialist, (206) 586-2320; John Anderson, Coordinator, Schools for the 21st Century, (206) 586-4512; Department of Public Instruction, Old Capitol Building, P.O. Box 47200, Olympia, WA 98504-7200

West Virginia—Tony G. Smedley, Coordinator, Staff Development; Robert L. Harrison, Jr., Director, Office of Professional Development; West Virginia Department of Education, 1900 Kanawha Boulevard East, Capitol Complex Building 6 Room B-252, Charleston, WV 25305-0330 (304) 558-2702

Wisconsin—Kathryn Lind, Director, Beginning Teacher Assistance, Department of Public Instruction, 125 S. Webster Street, Madison, WI 53707-7841 (608) 266-1788

Wyoming—Linda Stowers, Director, Professional Teaching Standards Board, State Department of Education, 2300 Capitol Avenue, Hathaway Building, 2nd Floor, Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050 (307) 777-6261